

Also, petition of Beal Byron Co., of New York, protesting against any restrictions being placed on motor boats; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Nelson O. Tiffany, jr., of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of citizens of Ford County, Kans., against passage of bills for Sunday closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Larned, Kans., against passage of House bill 8348; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Morton County, Kans., favoring amending the pending joint committee bill on rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of citizens of Fort Dodge, Kans., against passage of bills to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Samuel M. Newmark and 54 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woman's Civic Club of Fortuna, Cal., favoring appropriation of \$300,000 for Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of S. M. Hughes and three other citizens of Los Angeles; J. Vaughan, San Pedro; and Charles C. Townsend, Lancaster, all in the State of California, favoring the Warren bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Home Investment Building & Loan Association and Metropolitan Loan Association, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring relief from Federal emergency excise-tax act; to the committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Schiller Lodge, No. 34, Sons of Herman, and Louis Karl and 23 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring embargo on munitions of war, and protesting against loans to belligerent countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Beaumont, Cal., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, letters from Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the formation of a new land district to include Imperial County and the eastern portion of Riverside County; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Pedic Society of San Francisco, Cal., favoring bill to regulate the practice of pediatry or chiropody in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Bakers' Union No. 25, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring House bill 137, investigation into sanitary conditions surrounding the marketing of dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of Prof. William C. Farrar, Bethel College, Kentucky, against erecting power plant near Washington Monument; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of citizens of Fort Morgan, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Northeastern Weld County (Colo.) Educational Association, Esther L. Shanebo, Coleman, Colo., president, against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Union League Club of Chicago, Ill., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am not going to ask to have read the mass of telegrams I have received and which I have before me begging the Senate to retain section 56 in the bill. I am simply going to call attention to the fact that they come from sources not interested in these encampments, but men who are anxious to see a proper measure enacted that will assist in raising a volunteer force.

I have before me 356 telegrams coming from New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Portland, Oreg., New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other points than the cities I have named in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Montana, Virginia, Delaware, and Vermont. Some of the telegrams are from officers of the National Guard of these States. I have one particularly from a gentleman in Oregon who has been adjutant general of the State for a great many years, who served with the Second Oregon Volunteers in the Philippines as a major and was afterwards judge advocate general in the Philippines, and he favors section 56 very strongly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|------------|
| Ashurst | Gallinger | McCumber | Sherman |
| Bankhead | Harding | Martin, Va. | Simmons |
| Beckham | Hitchcock | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Ga. |
| Brady | Hollis | Myers | Smith, Md. |
| Brandeggee | Hughes | Nelson | Smoot |
| Broussard | Husting | Norris | Sterling |
| Burleigh | Johnson, Me. | O'Gorman | Stone |
| Catron | Johnson, S. Dak. | Oliver | Swanson |
| Chamberlain | Jones | Overman | Taggart |
| Chilton | Kenyon | Page | Thomas |
| Clapp | Kern | Pittman | Townsend |
| Clarke, Ark. | Lane | Pomerene | Underwood |
| Culberson | Lee, Md. | Robinson | Warren |
| Cummins | Lewis | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| Dillingham | Lippitt | Shafroth | Williams |
| du Pont | Lodge | Sheppard | Works |

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I wish also to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to announce the absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. He has been called to his State on pressing business.

Mr. KERN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I started to make a brief statement awhile ago and was interrupted by the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and I will make it now.

Since the Senate adjourned yesterday afternoon I have received about 360 telegrams, including some that have just come to me since I started my former statement. The telegrams are from citizens of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Portland, Oreg., and also from different cities in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Montana, Virginia, Delaware, and Vermont, protesting against the elimination of section 56 from the bill. I desire to say that these telegrams come from persons who attended the Plattsburg and similar training camps, and many officers of the State militia—of the National Guard, I should probably say—veterans of the Spanish-American War, and others.

One of the strongest protests against the elimination of this section is from Judge Gantenbein, of Portland, Oreg., which reached me this morning, calling attention to the fact that he had seen the statement in the early morning papers, the midnight edition of the papers, about what was done here. Judge Gantenbein is one of the circuit judges of my city. For a number of years he was adjutant general of the State. He was an officer in the Second Oregon Volunteer Regiment in the Philippines, and served during the occupation as judge advocate, and has had very broad experience. He protests most strenuously against the elimination of section 56.

I have also a characteristic telegram, which I will read, from a guardsman, dated at Baltimore, this morning. He says:

As a member of the first training regiment, Plattsburg, 1915, and also as first lieutenant, Maryland National Guard, emphatically urge the passage of section 56 of Senate military bill.

J. CRAIG McLANAHAN.

Another is from New Jersey, which says:

As a militiaman of 25 years' enlisted and commissioned service I emphatically protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan embodied section 56 Senate bill and urge passage of this section; also against amendment attaching militia officers to General Staff to control militia affairs, this being opposed to sound development and future effectiveness of militia.

ARTHUR H. MACKIE,
Major, First New Jersey Infantry.

I call attention to these telegrams. I will not ask to have them read into the Record, but I desire to have a record made of the fact that I have received these telegrams, all protesting against the elimination of section 56.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegrams will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record a letter and a number of telegrams received from citizens of the State of New York and elsewhere protesting against the elimination of section 56 in the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter and telegrams referred to are as follows:

HON. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
New York City, April 5, 1916.
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: The present Congress is engaged upon consideration of two questions which vitally affect the future of this country.

1. The increase in the Standing Army, including reorganization of the State militia.

2. The increase in our naval program, including increase in the personnel of the Navy.

History unquestionably teaches us that the country which is not prepared to meet other countries upon at least an equal war footing is doomed to recede from the position which it otherwise would hold in the community of nations, and by reason of its consequent inability to enforce respect for its rights and the privileges of its citizens by so much forfeits the respect of the other nations of the world.

Our present Standing Army, from the standpoint of personnel and equipment, is so ridiculously inadequate as to make us a laughing stock among the other nations of the world. By this I do not mean to imply that man for man our Army, the personnel of our Regular Army, will not equal in efficiency that of any other nation of the world. But that will not win battles against superior forces. As my Senator I write to emphasize upon you that as one of your constituents I am most emphatically in favor of an increase in our Standing Army to at least 250,000 men, providing at the same time for an adequate reserve.

I am also in favor of more thorough training of the State militia and a coordination of the various units thereof, so as to subject it to centralized control. In this connection I consider the Hay bill worse than no provision whatever for the necessities of our present case, and I trust that you will do everything in your power to defeat that bill and to bring about the passage of a bill establishing our military policy upon the broadest lines.

As to the Navy, our Navy is not only our first weapon of offense, but, as the situation now stands, our first and only effective weapon of defense. The coast line which the United States would have to protect in the event of hostilities is many times greater than that of any other country with which we might come into conflict and our Navy considerably smaller than that of any such country. We have a considerably more effective machine in our Navy to-day than we have in our Army, but owing to the unfortunate policy of the present administration this effectiveness is potential rather than actual.

I am emphatically in favor of bringing our Navy to 100 per cent effectiveness and for increasing the size of the Navy proportionately to the extent of our coast line and its requirements in the event of hostilities. This means an energetic prosecution of a naval program substantially as recommended by the General Board of the Navy.

Many good citizens are fearful lest the present Congress will attempt to foist upon the Nation a bill with regard to the Navy similar in its effect to the Hay bill.

I trust that you will do everything in your power to oppose such destructive legislation and to effect adequate constructive legislation in this respect.

Very truly, yours,

ALFRED ELY.

NEW YORK, April 6, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge you to make every effort to prevent defeat of section 56, Senate military bill; we need training camps.

GUSTAV SCWAW.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

The Volunteer Army movement must not be jeopardized by politics. I went to Plattsburg, finished the march in the ambulance, and have gotten many men to go this year. They most decidedly would not join the Guard.

CONRAD G. GODDARD,
Roslyn, Long Island, N. Y.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully urge upon you the necessity of approving section 56 in the Senate bill on military organization now under consideration. I feel very strongly about this.

J. A. RIPLEY.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan in section 56 of Senate bill, and emphatically urge passage of this section.

F. B. Marshall, Halsey French, William Meadowcroft, Alexander S. Farmer, Alfred W. Arenader, Alfred A. Schener, Geo. A. Griffin, Wm. Lamson, Wm. J. Coakley, Geo. J. Bourke, Thomas C. Norton, Arthur S. Tuttle, Vernon S. Moon, Arthur H. Pratt, Aswald W. Hill, Kenneth Allen, John E. Hill, Wm. I. Foster, F. X. A. Purcell, A. G. Thomas, H. M. Foster.

Senator O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Vote against Lee amendment; section 56 must be retained.

ALEXANDER GORDON,
61 Broadway, New York.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Request you vote against Lee amendment striking out section 56.

THEODORE T. LANE.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

As a member of the first Plattsburg training regiment, I emphatically protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill, and urge upon you the passage of this section which practically contemplates a national system of Plattsburg camps.

JOSEPH J. FRANK,
New York City.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Emphatically indorse section 56 of Senate military bill. The opportunity to serve Nation in a Federal force would make available not less than hundred thousand men annually who can not or will not join any State militia.

DELANCEY K. JAY.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge emphatically adoption section 56, Senate Army bill, and protest utmost indignation attempt defeat it.

HERBERT K. STOCKTON,
27 William Street.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

The Plattsburg Chamber of Commerce protests against the dropping from the Army bill of section 56, providing for a Federal reserve. We regard this section as based upon the fundamental duty of citizenship, the duty of national defense, and as a step toward a broader recognition of this duty.

W. J. JAKUES,
President Plattsburg Chamber of Commerce.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Emphatically urge passage section 56, Federal reserve bill.

FRANK DAWSON.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly believe that section 56 of Senate bill 4840 should be retained, because I think that a Federal reserve is the most effective means of defense and that voluntary training camps, such as were held at Plattsburg last summer, should be permanently established by law.

W. R. BEGG,
24 Broad Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I have followed closely the newspaper accounts of the course of the proposed military legislation in Congress. I understand that there is opposition to section 56 of Senate bill No. 4840. I earnestly hope that you will use your efforts to overcome this opposition.

A. L. HUMES,
Plaza Hotel, New York City.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to the national defense bill now pending before the Senate, we heartily indorse the Regular Army increase and the Federal reserve plans as now embodied in the bill. In view of the inadequacy for national defense of any Regular Army which the American people will support, in view of the collapse of the State militia as a national defensive system in every crisis of our history, and in view of the uselessness of untrained volunteers in modern war, we most emphatically protest against any weakening of the Federal reserve provisions unless there is provided the only adequate substitute, universal military training under exclusive Federal control.

F. G. Sheridan, Albert Buttendorf, Fred E. Moore, Wm. W. Kerr, Geo. Fuchs, Chas. R. Cockey, Chester W. Allen, W. J. Buhrendorf, J. L. Murphy, David Kurtzweg, L. P. Wood, F. H. Robbins, Frederick F. Dibbelins, Jos. S. Stull, Jr., Allen E. Shannon, Clifford Zaver, Adam H. Brenzinger, Geo. R. Farwill, John W. Langguth, Torris Elde, H. O. Tafel, J. Howard Williams, Alexander H. Fox, W. J. Cormack.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I hope you will use your influence to secure approval of section 56 in Senate bill regarding training camps. I am satisfied from my personal experience at Plattsburg that these camps are a necessary aid in national defense.

FRANCIS W. AYMAR.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of Senate bill 4840, because my experience at Plattsburg last summer convinces me that the plan is of the greatest value as a measure of defense. The plan in no way conflicts with the interests of the National Guard, of which I am a member, and it gives an opportunity for military training to men who can not belong to the National Guard. It also offers to members of the National Guard a chance for a supplementary training under conditions approximating those of actual service. I have seen something of both methods of training, and I wish to say very earnestly that if there were any necessity of choosing between the two the Federal reserve would be more efficient and reliable.

HOWARD H. BROWN,
116 West Sixty-ninth Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 4, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Military Training Camps Association of the United States of 4,200 men from all sections who have attended Federal training camps, and representing also not less than 30,000 citizens who will attend this year's camps, at a cost of \$2,000,000 to themselves, we earnestly protest against attempt to defeat section 56, Senate military bill. This section, without impairing National Guard, will make available for service of Nation tens of thousands who under no circumstances can be made available under a National Guard system.

MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

As a member of first training regiment, I wish to protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill, and emphatically urge the passage of this section.

WILLIAM S. SEAMAN, JR.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Esq.,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I protest against attempt to kill training-camps movement. Pass section 56 of Senate bill and give us a chance to defend our lives and honor in case of war.

EDMOND PATTEN GLOVER.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As a thorough believer in Federal training-camps movement, I sincerely hope that the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of Senate bill will become law, and I desire to enter a vigorous protest against alleged attempt to defeat this provision. Any modification of Chamberlain bill in direction of weak, deceptive, and wasteful Hay bill would be national misfortune. If Congress appreciated the widespread national determination for adequate military and naval preparedness and favoring complete federalization of all military forces and acceptance of the recommendations of General Staff, the Chamberlain bill would be passed by overwhelming majority.

ARCHIBALD G. TEACHER,
59 Wall Street.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I attended the Plattsburg business men's camp last summer and am a member of the New York National Guard. In my opinion, the plan embodied in section 56 of Senate bill 4840 offers every opportunity to create a reserve of far greater efficiency and reliability than a federalized militia National Guard. Opposition to this section is utterly unjustifiable, even on the assumption that a federalized militia will be as reliable and as efficient as a reserve created under section 56. To constitute a federalized National Guard the only reserve is to discriminate against men who are willing and anxious to serve in a reserve, but who for business or other reasons are unable or unwilling to join the National Guard. Furthermore, section 56 should be retained because it put the military training camps upon a permanent basis, and thereby offers an opportunity for military training to men who are unable or unwilling to join a reserve in time of peace, but who would be the first to volunteer in case of war.

HARRISON TWEED,
103 East Eighty-sixth Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Washington:

I wish to urge that section 56 of Senate bill 4840 should be retained, for the reason that a Federal reserve is the most effective and desirable means of national defense, and for the further reason that voluntary training camps such as were held at Plattsburg should be established upon a permanent basis.

B. H. INNESS BROWN.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I desire to protest most strongly against effort to defeat Federal reserve plan, section 56, military preparedness bill.

H. S. DUELL.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Washington:

Please use your influence to secure adoption section 56 of Senate military bill. This provision can not hurt National Guard and will

create an adequate reserve at a minimum cost. Camps this year throughout United States will be paid for by citizens attending.

JOHN R. VAN HOME.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Having had opportunity of observing at first hand as present member National Guard, State of New York, hopelessness of attempting to obtain really efficient and dependable soldiery through drills held in armories one night a week during winter, supplemented only by short encampments in the field in summer, and believing that attempt to federalize militia will result in large expenditures public money without adequate return, and will, in fact, result only in creating false feeling of security, I urge upon you vital necessity of retaining in Senate bill 4840 provisions of section 56, which leave way open for creation of reserve of Federal volunteers and retention of Federal training camps.

WINTHROP W. ALDRICH,
45 East Sixty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

As citizens who have had little, if any, military training, who believe that the national safety demands that all citizens receive thorough military training who are planning to attend the Plattsburg camps this summer at considerable inconvenience and expense, we emphatically protest against any weakening of the Federal reserve provisions of the pending defense bill unless there is provided the only adequate substitute—universal military training under exclusive Federal control.

CLARENCE F. BELL, ELDA L. KIMMEY, P. W. O'GRADY, ALLEN E. SHANNON, EDGAR F. SMITH, JOSEPH S. STULL, JR., ARTHUR R. HOLBROOK, THOMAS H. WIGGIN, FREDERICK F. GRISWOLD, CLINTON L. BOGERT, JACOB M. GRAY, CHARLES R. COCKEY, EDWARD W. THODE, C. RAYMOND HULSART.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I beg you to fight for retention section 56, Senate Army bill.
HENRY H. CURRAN,
Republican Leader, Board of Aldermen.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I learn that the Senate contemplates elimination from Army bill provision for Federal reserve. This is the most important provision of the bill, being in some measure a recognition of the obligation of universal military service and the beginning of a real policy of preparedness. I emphatically urge the retention of this section.

ARTHUR WM. BARBER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We understand efforts being made to defeat policy looking toward Federal training camps as outlined in section 56 in Senate bill now under consideration. We earnestly protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan embodied in this section and strongly urge the passage of same.

HORACE BOWKER,
C. M. SHULTZ.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Save section 56, Army bill, and authorize Federal reserve plan.
L. E. WIMAN.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington:

In my opinion section 56 of Senate bill 4840 should be retained, because a Federal reserve is the best means of national defense and because voluntary camps such as were held at Plattsburg should be officially recognized and permanently established.

CARL TAYLOR,
24 Broad Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan in section 56 of Senate bill and emphatically urge passage of this section.
PIRIE MACDONALD.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly urge you to give your fullest support to Federal reserve plan as embodied in section 56, Senate bill now under consideration, and to work for its passage.

Respectfully,

W. R. MAY,
121 East Thirty-eighth Street, New York.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Trust you will use every effort to retain section 56, providing for Federal training camps. Regard this as essential to sound national system of defense.

JAMES D. WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAS. A. O'GORMAN,
U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned citizens of the United States protest against the attempt to defeat the Federal reserve plan in section 56 of the Senate bill, and emphatically urge the passage of this section.

J. P. Hogan, J. S. Langthorn, F. H. Pond, M. J. Ungrich,
C. W. Coffin, Wm. B. Hunter, Roger W. Armstrong,
Jas. F. Sanbern, Chas. Goodman, Robt. J. Vanepps,
James G. Grimes, Harry R. Bouton.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will give your support to bills pending providing for continuance of Plattsburg and similar training camps; sentiment of this community strongly favors such legislation. Only five attended Plattsburg from here last year, as a result of their experiences more than 100 will go this year.

E. P. EDWARDS,
President, Schenectady Rifle Club.

ITHACA, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your support of measures for providing a Federal volunteer force.

R. C. CANDEE,
G. R. PHIPPS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES O'GORMAN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully and most earnestly ask your support for Federal reserve measure in section 56 of the Senate bill.

JNO. AUER.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAS. A. O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Urge most emphatically the passage of section 56 of the Senate military bill providing for Federal reserve; protest earnestly against defeat of this section.

L. QUIGLEY,
108 West Sixty-ninth Street, New York City.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I understand that section 56, regarding training camps, of the Senate Army bill is in danger of being defeated, the removal of this section would devitalize the bill and the State will not sanction feeble attempts at preparedness.

H. L. MEIERHOF.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., April 5, 1916.

Senator JAS. A. O'GORMAN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

The Rochester national-defense contingent, more than 700 strong and growing, vigorously protests attempt to kill section 56 of the Senate bill, permitting Secretary of War to conduct the Federal training camps. We urge your best efforts in support of the passage of this section.

N. R. POTTER,
Member of the Executive Committee.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

As one who went to Plattsburg last summer and who expects to go again this year, and as a member of the Veteran Corps of Artillery, I urge you to do your utmost to secure the passage of Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill.

H. F. STONE.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Plattsburg behind Chamberlain bill. Please oppose Hay bill.

J. H. MALLORRY.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1916.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Favor strongly bill authorizing the President or Secretary of War organizing Federal volunteers in peace times and conducting training camps under Federal control. Understand article 56 of Federal reserve plan bill now before Senate contemplates this. Emphatically urge passage of this section and protest strongly any attempt to defeat same.

H. S. LEVERICH,
ROBERT PETTIGREW,
M. M. MURPHY,
L. E. HUTTON.

STAPLETON, N. Y., April 5.

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

As a member of the business men's training camp, held at Plattsburg last summer. I wish to emphatically urge the passage of section 56 of the Senate bill now under consideration, regarding the Federal reserve plan, which I consider a most important measure in the plan for national defense.

R. C. WIGAND.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, something was said yesterday by certain of the Senators regarding an extremely offensive propaganda organized by certain citizens who are especially

interested in the National Guard. I hold a letter in my hand addressed to me and signed by H. S. Sternberger, colonel, on the letterhead of the Headquarters Division, National Guard, New York Municipal Building, New York City. I shall ask to have this letter read.

It will be noted that it lacks the phraseology of the ordinary communication from a citizen to a Senator or to any other public official. It is more in the nature of a command to eliminate the volunteer army provision from the pending bill. It is based upon a positively selfish proposition, namely, that in the opinion of the writer the adoption of that provision will be prejudicial to the National Guard. He loses sight entirely of the larger and the more patriotic aspect of the question as to what is the best thing for the country in this grave crisis.

I ask that the letter may be read by the Secretary, including the heading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS DIVISION, NATIONAL GUARD, NEW YORK,
New York City, April 4, 1916.

From: Chief of the Quartermaster Corps.

To: Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN, Washington, D. C.

Subject: National Guard legislation.

1. I desire to inform you that the Hay bill as passed is satisfactory to the National Guard, and I urge particularly that sections 76 and 77 of the House bill as passed be incorporated in the Senate bill. I am opposed to section 58 of the old Chamberlain bill, which authorizes the President to organize volunteers in time of peace; this, to my mind, is detrimental to all the National Guard.

2. I wish to call to your attention the fact that I shall use my influence, not only with National Guardsmen but with all citizens whom I come in contact, toward pointing out to them that the so-called continental army scheme is impracticable and would have a bad result if passed. I urge upon you as Senator from New York State, having about 18,000 National Guardsmen in active service at present, and about three times that number who have served in the National Guard, to oppose any contemplated measure that is detrimental to the interests of the National Guard at large.

H. S. STERNBERGER, Colonel.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have not the honor of any personal acquaintance with the writer of that letter, and I suspect he does not know me. If he did, he might know that the tone of his communication was not calculated to be persuasive with me. I am not accustomed to accept dictation from any source, and in a matter of this grave character I resent any attempt at coercion from any person.

Now, Mr. President, with regard to one objection the writer of that letter makes against the provision for the volunteer army, let me make this observation. The head of the National Guard in the State of New York is Maj. Gen. O'Ryan, a man of fine character and unusual military ability. He is probably the only officer connected with the National Guard in any State in this country who has been invited to take the course in the War College in this city, and he has completed it. In the opinion of Regular Army officers he is a born soldier. I am sure that the subordinate officer who wrote the offensive note to me was not voicing the sentiment of the patriotic citizens of the State of New York who are identified with the National Guard in that State, and that this volunteer army provision will not impair the efficiency of the National Guard is shown by a letter written by Gen. O'Ryan, which I shall read. Under date of January 17, 1916, Gen. O'Ryan stated:

The question is sometimes asked whether there is any conflict of interest or of effort between the organizations of the National Guard and the training camps for college and business men. This question may not only be answered emphatically in the negative, but it may be affirmatively stated with equal emphasis that the training regiments have been of benefit to the National Guard of this State at least. A very considerable number of men of the Plattsburg training regiment have joined organizations of the New York division, some as commissioned officers and some as enlisted men.

Wholly aside from the foregoing, there is another aspect of the training camps which should not be lost sight of. There are in some localities men who desire military training, but who are so circumstanced that they can not make available for the purpose the amount of time demanded by service in the National Guard. Some of the men in this class find it possible to devote 30 days for training during the summer months. The training camps furnish the needed opportunity for men in this class. These camps are, therefore, performing a service to the Nation in respect to such men which it is not possible for the National Guard to perform.

I have no hesitation in urging upon officers of the National Guard throughout the State their fullest cooperation in support of the excellent movement represented by the training camps. In New York State facilities have been provided in some of the armories for detachments of men of the training camps who desire to continue the work begun at Plattsburg.

Mr. President, the proposed volunteer army is a development of the training system referred to in this letter of Gen. O'Ryan, and I prefer to accept the opinion of this gentleman on this question rather than the criticisms here and elsewhere of men not so well qualified to speak on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I would regard it as being extremely unfortunate if, as a result of this debate, a prejudice

should be aroused throughout the country against the officers of the National Guard in the different States. For the men who have given their time and their services substantially without compensation to the National Guard in my own State I could not say anything but a good word. Many of those gentlemen have expressed to me their opinion that section 56 would not only be to the detriment of the National Guard, but, in their opinion, would work ill instead of good to the country. In expressing that opinion I believe that they are acting, as they always have acted in military affairs, from motives of extreme patriotism. After a careful study of the subject, however, I am constrained to disagree with them; but, notwithstanding that, Mr. President, I know that they are honest in what they say and that they believe every word that they tell me, I can not now refrain from expressing my dissent from some of the expressions that have been given out in the course of this debate reflecting upon their motives in working for the elimination of this particular section.

I do not think they are right. I think, on the whole, that section 56 errs in not being strong enough; and if any amendment should be offered tending to strengthen it, I would vote for it.

I have received many telegrams favoring this section, and some in opposition to it. I hope the section will be retained, and I hope, but hardly expect, that it will be amended so as to make it stronger than it is as reported by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, if by occupying even a brief time I would materially delay action upon the pending bill and its amendments I would refrain from speaking, for I realize that, so far as influencing the vote of Senators is concerned, much of the discussion here is of no avail. My only excuse for saying anything at this time is to give an opportunity to the many people who have written me on the subject of preparedness, both for and against, to understand the reasons which will compel me to vote for reasonably adequate military protection to the United States. I am not a military expert and have felt it the part of patriotic duty to defer largely in matters of detail and efficiency to those practical military men whose high character, unquestioned ability, and expert study and experience have made them authorities on this subject. Unfortunately, these experts are not entirely agreed upon all matters affecting the question, and in such cases of disagreement I have tried consistently to weigh the arguments pro and con in order to reach the best conclusion possible.

It can not be reasonably denied by even the most optimistic pacifist that the most unusual and disturbing conditions obtain in the world and in the United States that have ever been known in our history. From the alluring dreams of commercialism, in which the specter of war never entered, the world awoke to the horrid reality of "grim-visaged war" astride the world. The change to our people was startling. The days passed and 10,000,000 men were equipped with appliances of war, the most appallingly destructive that the genius and invention of man could devise—engines the most deadly ever known to the world; poisonous gases which make fatal the very breath of life, flying machines dropping death from the clouds, submarine dragoons which fill the seas with terror. As these shocking facts became known the world gasped and civilization stood still. But gradually the news of millions slain and millions maimed for life became so common that local news and markets again held the attention, at least of the American people. Europe, drunk with human blood, became the reeling, ready market for war supplies made in the United States. During all this time, revolutions, one succeeding another without intermission, were devastating Mexico, in which were rightfully thousands of Americans and other foreigners, whose lives and properties were sacrificed under direction of bandit leaders. The relations of the United States with the European belligerents and with Mexico have been strained almost to the breaking point, and at no time has the situation been more critical than it is at present.

Great Britain has rewritten the international laws governing the rights of neutrals whenever her desire prompted, and American commerce of practically all kinds has been treated as contraband and American rights have been ignored. She has made the United States one of her most effective allies, and is offended at the even mild protests of our Government. Germany has violated the laws of warfare by sinking defenseless ships carrying American citizens, who, under the law of nations, had a legal, if not a moral, right to be upon them. She is offended at us because we have but weakly protested against Great Britain's policy of making us a party to the latter's wicked efforts to starve the women, children, and noncombatants of Germany. Russia has no existing treaty with the

United States and still cherishes resentment at our attempt a few years ago to meddle with her domestic affairs. Japan's memory still rankles with our Nation's attitude in the immigration matter and listens with ill-concealed displeasure to insults from Americans. She has not forgotten the school and land episodes in California nor her frustrated attempts to acquire Magdalena Bay, and it is possible that she feels the United States lessened the fruits of her victory in the late war with Russia. European nations hold us responsible for losses sustained by their nationals in Mexico and Mexico hates the United States with an undying hatred.

The Congress has not been permitted to know the exact situation of our foreign relations. The President and his Secretary of State probably do know. Some of the President's special envoys may know what Congress does not. But I shall not at this time nor on this bill enter into any extended criticism of the administration in its conduct of our foreign affairs. The present duty is nonpartisan, and, while I hold radical views as to the cause for much of our unpleasant national predicament, I recognize that it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us.

That our foreign affairs are critical, no thoughtful man can doubt. The things which I have mentioned and others are known. The President has issued a call for help. He has said that imminent danger threatened and that our country was insufficiently prepared to meet even the Mexican situation. He has warned the people that sparks were flying all around and that our country was in danger of a destructive conflagration. He is the head of the Army and Navy, and as such he has called upon Congress to give him an adequate Army to meet the present and prospective emergencies. It will respond now, as it always has responded, to every emergency call of the Commander in Chief. Congress and the country desire that our Republic shall be preserved against any reasonable possibility of dishonor or destruction. It has a mission for humanity which will require centuries to complete and a Congress which, through mistaken notions of economy or fear of personal political death, would fail to provide in an adequate degree insurance against national loss or destruction, would betray its trust, and become an enemy of democracy.

I feel that it is a higher duty to protect the country against the possibilities of foreign invasion than is the duty of a banker to protect his deposits against burglars or his home against fire. The banker is reasonably certain his bank will never be entered by thieves, yet he makes assurance double sure by installing a safe as nearly burglar proof as possible. Not one house in a thousand burns up, and yet he insures his home against fire. With the air full of sparks, as stated by the President, and our Nation's premises very inflammable, shall we not take out insurance?

Personally I have not worked myself into the hysteria of a great war fright, and yet I believe that the possibilities of international trouble were never so great as at present. Our government's conduct of foreign affairs has contributed to this condition. Our wealth and resources invite it. The world never saw so large a number of war-trained and seasoned soldiers at one time as are now under arms. War is now to them a profession. Its terrors have steeled their nerves and deadened their sensibilities. The greatest nations of Europe are war mad.

Russia and Japan were supposed to have been bankrupted by the recent war between them, and yet to-day, before the old wounds are healed, we find them stronger and more militant than ever. England had hardly recovered from the Boer War before she entered the present conflict. Our Revolutionary War prepared the United States to enter the struggle of 1812. Does anyone doubt that at the close of the Civil War those four-year veterans would have enlisted in a war against a foreign foe even more eagerly than they went to the front in sixty-one, and that the North and South would have united?

But I believe that preparation is especially necessary now that the President and the naval and military experts have admitted and advertised to the world our unpreparedness to cope with even weak and disrupted Mexico. We must defend the priceless heritage of democracy against reasonably possible invasion. But for the sake of peace we should show the world that we are prepared to protect our own. Such preparation will be a good investment. If we are reasonably prepared for a defensive war, we will never have one. If we are not so prepared, we may have one. It is because I love peace and hate war that I want to render my country immune to the latter by preparation. Does anyone doubt that the United States would not have been subjected to many of the insults and wrongs from Mexico and the European belligerents if we had not said "We are too proud to fight"; "We have not a sufficient Army and Navy"; "We will debate questions which

throughout our history were by our Government thought undebatable?"

The peace-loving, insult-resenting, just, and trained athletic giant is never insulted, is never attacked.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I want the United States to be in a position to lead in the world effort to make impossible another such war as that now waging. If through preparation we are practically immune to war we will have more influence at the council table of the nations than we will have if it is thought that fear and self-interest prompts our action. Better to spend a billion dollars in a program of defense, even if when it is completed our guns and armor are scrapped and our war craft are left to rot and rust at their moorings, than to lead our untrained youth to slaughter in an invited war and at a cost of many billions of dollars.

And so, Mr. President, being satisfied that it is the duty of this Congress to reorganize our Army and Navy with a view to greatly increasing their efficiency, the question with me is how and when to do it. As to how it shall be done, I have already stated that I am inclined to be governed largely in my vote by men whose training and experience fit them to advise. The time to begin is now. Indeed, we are already late in beginning. The very first business of this Congress should have been this work. Just as soon as the President saw the sparks flying, just as soon as he discovered that he was wrong when he condemned those men who said our country was without adequate defense, he should have used his great demonstrated power over Congress and urged its undivided attention to preparation. He should have speeded up the Government navy yards and private contractors who were working on ships authorized two and three years ago. This work has not been hastened, and to-day we have sixty-odd war craft that have been authorized and under construction for from one to three years. If an emergency need for a larger and more efficient Army and Navy exists, every energy of the Government and its agents should be employed to its limit of greatest efficiency. The administration has been so deliberate about this matter that I have sometimes wondered if the President really did see the dangers he so graphically described on his trip through the Middle West; and yet I feel that he is right now in urging speedy and adequate preparation. Dangers do confront us, and time may be of the very essence of our safety.

As to this particular bill, I think the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and his capable and experienced assistants on the committee have given it much study in preparation, and it seems about the least that can in good reason be done. I think that a greater increase in the Standing Army should be provided for the first two years. At the end of that period we may find that we do not need so large a further increase as we now anticipate, and the faster we fill up the reserve force with men who have had service with the colors the more efficient will be our defense. It does not seem to me that the addition of 16,000 men to our already concededly inadequate Army provided in this measure is a sufficient increase for the first year. It is probable, however, that the recruiting officers will have trouble in securing 16,000 enlistments in a year. Young men are not going to break madly away from jobs paying from \$15 to \$30 a week to join the Army at \$24 per month. It also seems to me it would have been wise to have provided for a little larger pay and more attractive inducements.

I favor the committee provision for regular reserves. I have some doubts about its being of much immediate avail, for the reason that young men may not enlist, but it is worth trying. There are thousands of patriotic men in this country who are willing to enlist in such a cause as this and under these provisions, and I think it would be better to have men who are closely connected with the colors ready at hand than to rely entirely upon the National Guard.

I am especially pleased with the provisions relating to the National Guard. That is a force already in existence. It is composed of the best young men in the States. This bill will give them an inspiration and a status which will increase their usefulness. The constitutional objections which have been urged against federalizing the State militia do not have as much weight with me as perhaps they ought to have. I realize, of course, that it is possible to conceive of a State that would not follow the discipline and training prescribed and followed by the Regular Army organization, but it is highly improbable that it would do so. Under existing statutes Regular Army officers are now drilling the State militia. If this bill becomes a law, the National Guard will have greater responsibilities, and it will, in my judgment, patriotically meet them. I have no doubt about the patriotism of the American people should our country be actually threatened with invasion by a foreign nation, but they must be convinced of the real danger. You

can not expect young men to give up their ambitions, their profitable and attractive vocations of peace, and enlist in a Regular Army when they are told on high authority that the talk of a foreign war is jingoism, that we are sufficiently prepared for any probable emergency, and that no reasonable possible danger threatens, even though a little later that same authority becomes panic-stricken and without specifications states that war is possible, that our country is unprepared, and danger is imminent. Personally I hold the opinion that we should have an effective standing army of 200,000 men with short term of service, but longer term of enlistment. We should have an efficient reserve of as many more men thoroughly trained and ready at all times to be called to the colors. My own notion is that if enlistments were made for four years with regular service in time of peace of not more than two years on full pay and then two years of service in the reserves with payment for period occupied in drill, both Regular Army and reserves could be recruited so as to remain at approximately full strength. This, with the provisions of the bill for the National Guard, would, in my judgment, prepare the country adequately for any reasonably possible emergency, and would not offend the popular objections to a large standing army and would not unduly increase the burden of taxes upon the people.

I am in hearty accord with the idea of military training in our schools and colleges. Such training should be compulsory upon every physically and mentally fit boy over 15 years of age, whether he be the son of a millionaire or of a laboring man. I favor this, not alone or largely for the possible needs of war, but for the good of the boys, and therefore for the welfare of the country. Military discipline and subjection to authority are necessary to the highest good of the citizens of a republic. Such discipline is conducive to straighter, stronger, healthier men, and subjection to properly constituted authority is one of the first lessons which the citizen should learn. Neither wealth nor station should exempt any fit man from service to his country if occasion requires it. With such training our present standing army would be abundantly sufficient. If we were so prepared, Mr. President, every nation—aye, all the nations combined—would hesitate long before engaging in a war of conquest against the United States. It would answer the charge of militarism, the complaint of political influence by the Army, and relieve the people of the great burden of cost. The people do not yet understand this plan, however, and popular sentiment seems to be against it, but in time it will be adopted. In the meanwhile it becomes my duty to vote for the best thing that is possible at this time, which is the pending amended bill.

I wish I knew how much the greed of gain has had to do with our present need of preparation. I wish I knew the real status of our foreign relations. But I do not, nor can I know. Our trouble with poverty-stricken, revolution-torn Mexico has disclosed our military weakness, and 20,000 volunteers have been asked to enlist for the purpose of entering, if need be, the sun-struck, famine-infested deserts and barrens of the alleged Republic to the south of us. The President as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy is crying danger and appealing for help. I must under these circumstances, from what real knowledge I have of the situation, believe that he has not so completely reversed himself on the question of our Nation's defenses without sufficient cause, and I prefer to vote the people's money to prevent future possible trouble, even though a knowledge of the real facts might make it unnecessary, than by inaction to make possible a greater loss from disastrous invasion and the possible destruction of thousands of my countrymen.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, there is some good in section 56; and the good that is in section 56 is the basis found in the plan or system of training camps, originating, I believe, at Plattsburg, N. Y., last year.

I do not think anyone fails to appreciate the value of these training camps, and if we could have had a plain provision in this bill—and I believe I can point out a way in which we could have one—for the development and encouragement of these camps, placing the participants in the encampments under an oath of enlistment for a term of years so that they would be subject at any time to call, it would have been a very meritorious measure.

I was much interested in the letter read by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] this morning, which I think illuminates the background from whence the telegrams come that have come here this morning. That letter, signed by Gen. John F. O'Ryan, relates not to a nebulous proposition, which some members of the committee themselves admit they do not yet understand, embodied in section 56, but it relates to the encouragement of training camps; and I believe the sentiment that is reflected here this morning in the telegrams comes from those who believe in the training camps and can not come from

a full understanding of the complexities of section 56, when the members of the committee, when asked as to the purpose to be effected by that section, are unable to state what that section means.

Mr. President, I do not believe there can be any conflict between the training camps, carried to the extent of enlistment for a term of years of the men who participate in those training camps, and the National Guard. It is a little singular that the other day we were treated here to the suggestion that the National Guard was seeking to influence legislation, when this morning we are treated to the spectacle of a deluge of telegrams designed to affect legislation in the counteraspect and along the counterlines.

If it were possible to take section 56 and convert it into a plain section, plainly stating what was meant, so that there could be no difference of opinion among the members of the committee themselves as to what it meant, it would be a wise step to take. Section 56 refers to and brings into it and makes a part of it another law. You go to that law, and you find that that law incorporates another law; and we have here the spectacle of a provision proposed to be enacted which will require the consultation of three separate, independent statutes to understand what the provision means.

Under this view of the case I am impelled, I think, to vote against the provision. If the provision prevails, we will have it for what it is worth. If it is defeated, I am satisfied that there will be a measure offered in its place that will plainly point out just what is intended, and effectuate, develop, and enlarge the training-camp plan.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PITTMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CLAPP. With pleasure.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator seems to be favorable to the idea that section 56 should be eliminated from the bill. I desire to ask the Senator what provision would be made for a reserve force if the National Guard provision should be held to offend the Constitution of the United States? In that contingency there will be, of course, no provision for a reserve.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the National Guard provision can not be held to offend the Constitution practically in this, that when there is a call to arms the National Guard, consisting, as it will, of units, will, in the main, as in the Spanish War, be ready to enlist; and once enlisted into the Federal force, it becomes subject to the Federal law.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator admits, then, that, notwithstanding this proposed legislation, so far as it affects the National Guard, in the event of war it will be entirely optional with the members of the National Guard as to whether they will leave their own States?

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Minnesota does not admit that, by any means.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, is there any doubt that the National Guard can be called into service by the President for the purpose of suppressing insurrection or repelling invasion in any part of the United States?

Mr. CLAPP. None whatever. More than that, the Supreme Court has held that repelling invasion may consist of counterinvasion, the President being the one to determine as to the expediency of that; but, as putting it beyond any pale of controversy, these men can be enlisted. The Senator from New York does not understand me. I would have the camps. I would have these men take an oath that for a given number of years, whatever term might be fixed upon, they should be subject to call to arms.

As illustrating the ambiguity, the uncertainty of section 56, if war should come with section 56 in operation, we would have an indefinite number, from our present standpoint, of men who had received the training of these camps, and who would be dispersed throughout the country. On the other hand, we would have our concrete National Guard units, companies, regiments, brigades, and, I think in two States, divisions. Now, the question is, Which would be first called upon?

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] offered an amendment plainly stating that under those circumstances the National Guard should be first called. That that is the theory of the chairman of the committee is evident from the fact that the chairman of the committee insists that with section 56 enacted as it now reads, and in connection with these other three laws that you would have to read to find out what section 56 means, the National Guard would be first called upon. Whatever doubt there may be as to the correctness of that interpretation, it is an admission that the National Guard

should first be called upon, because there is no suggestion from the chairman that the law which he claims makes that provision should be repealed.

With that admission, why should there be any doubt about it? Why not accept an amendment that will put it beyond any question? And yet, when another member of the committee was asked that question yesterday morning, he was unable to answer the question. I think he might well make that admission, for I do not believe that the provision found in the Dick bill, enacted at a time when this provision of section 56 was unthought of, would cover the men enlisted under section 56.

I have always contended, since I have been in the Senate, that a law should be plain. It is sometimes excusable that we err in judgment; it is sometimes excusable that we are unable to state plainly matters difficult of statement; but there is no excuse for not stating plainly a matter which is susceptible of plain statement, and I do not believe legislation should be enacted in this form.

I can justify voting against this section, because I am satisfied that if section 56 is stricken out there will be substituted for it a plain, practical provision for carrying on and developing training camps, and providing that those who participate in those training camps shall be sworn into the service.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. CLAPP. With pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. I have listened with interest to what the Senator says. He seems to doubt whether this section meets the views of those who have been in, or wish to go into, camps for training. If the Senator will permit me, here is a telegram from the executive committee of the Association of Training Camps that I should like to have read; but of course the Senator—

Mr. CLAPP. I have no objection to its being read. I should then want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suppose every Senator has received it, perhaps.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. If so, they can say so; but it refers directly to the question that the Senator now has under discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. WARREN. I will say that it is not a late telegram. The date will be given by the Secretary. It is not one of those that came to-day.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 4, 1916.

HON. FRANCIS E. WARREN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Military Training Camps Association of the United States, consisting of 4,200 men from all sections who have attended Federal training camps and representing also not less than 30,000 citizens who will attend this year's camps at a cost of \$2,000,000 to themselves, we earnestly protest against attempt to defeat section 56, Senate military bill. This section, without impairing National Guard, will make available for service of Nation tens of thousands who, under no circumstances can be made available under a National Guard system.

MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he regards that telegram as decisive of an inquiry which was made here the other day and remains unanswered, and that is as to whether there will be headquarters established with all the paraphernalia necessary for the prompt mobilization of troops corresponding to the units which might be made up of the men who participate in these training encampments.

Mr. WARREN. I will answer the Senator. The fifty-sixth is a short section and does not go into detail, but it refers specifically to the law now on the statute books passed within the last two years providing for volunteer forces. Under that act, of course, the units are the same, or relatively the same, as in the Regular Army. The Senator will keep it in mind in reading section 56 that it leaves it with the President as to calling them out. It leaves it also with the President as to how those units shall be formed, as to some particulars, just exactly as the Hay bill has done and more or less the Chamberlain bill, so that there may be additional transportation trains and other matters that are only useful when the troops are expected to go immediately into active service. In the meantime, it would only be carried as far as to train the men in these camps up to the point where, when trains for transportation, and so forth, were made up, they would have passed over all the elementary parts and be ready to take hold of the larger matters, and would be that much ahead of the volunteers who were not enlisted until war was actually upon us and our men utterly without military knowledge.

Mr. CLAPP. In other words, the Senator has not thrown any light on the question which I asked him, if he thought the sender of that telegram had in mind—

Mr. WARREN. The sender of that telegram—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and to whom?

Mr. CLAPP. I am yielding now to the Senator from Wyoming, as he is replying to my question.

Mr. WARREN. The telegram follows the—

Mr. CLAPP. I suggest that the Senator confine his interruption to an inquiry.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say that the executive committee were here in person and discussed that matter with the committee, and they stated that section 56 would meet the views of that association, and that under it they would enlist.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question about the telegram.

Mr. CLAPP. I shall have to decline, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I am not going to make a speech. I want to ask a question. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he does not have some reason to believe that the telegram which he read is one of a lot of canned telegrams emanating from a common source and in substantially the same phraseology?

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I would dislike to ask that question, because I have taken the stand that we ought not to deal with any of these telegrams from that attitude. I believe in the right, and more than that, I believe it is the duty of our citizens to freely communicate their views to the Members of this body.

Mr. REED. So do I, Mr. President, and if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. CLAPP. I can not yield except for a question.

Mr. DU PONT. I wish to answer the Senator as to where the headquarters of the corps are to be established. I understand that it will be in the War Department.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, I have an answer. The headquarters of this force will be in the War Department. It has been insisted on this floor that there would be units organized and each one would have its officers and they would have somewhere a central place that they might call headquarters. On the other hand, I have gone through the various laws that this proposed law refers to, and I can find no authority for that suggestion, and the question remains practically unanswered yet as to what will be the locus of these various organizations which may be trained into units, composed of the men who attend these camps.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLAPP. For an inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. All those details are embodied in the act of the Sixty-third Congress which provides for a volunteer force. This revives it. The whole thing is there, and we do not want to repeat it.

Mr. CLAPP. Then, if that is true, this requires a little illumination.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know who can illuminate it better than the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. That act provides for details of men who are called to arms and kept under arms in units all the time until their term of service expires. I submit there is not a Senator on this floor who would admit or suggest that this bill contemplates the calling of these men to a locality as men called to arms and keeping them at that locality in the interim between these terms of camp-training experience and activity.

Again, the other question remains unanswered, and now, as throwing light on the telegram offered by the Senator from Wyoming, the training-camp organization committee that has this matter in charge contemplates that there can be 100,000 men secured at an expense of something like \$3,000,000. They never dreamed of the expense contemplated by this provision. The estimates of the Senate committee contemplate twenty-four millions the first year. The training-camp committee, on the other hand, had in mind the training-camp proposition, which is a valuable thing, giving to the citizens of this country the opportunity of military training and supplementing that with an enlistment that requires them to respond to a call to arms if made within the time of the enlistment.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that on an important matter like this, instead of being told, as we were told yesterday, to first vote the provision in and then ascertain what it means, we ought first ascertain what is proposed by the section, and

if we can agree as to the purpose thus disclosed then adopt the section, and if we can not agree then reject it. Feeling certain as I do that the Senate, in case section 56 is rejected, will make a prompt and complete provision for training camps contemplated by the letter read by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and contemplated by the telegrams that we have received here this morning, I believe it is my duty to insist, as far as I can through the activities of my vote, in requiring that section 56 be made plain and explicit. I believe under the existing condition in the Senate the only way that can be accomplished is to strike out section 56 and then put in a substitute over which there can be no discussion as to what it means.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the chairman of the committee, is not here at this moment. I feel that he was most unfortunate in a portion of his remarks yesterday where he said—I read from the RECORD:

Mr. President, if the National Guard intends to come here as a political force, as it has done—there is not any question about that.

I insist that that is a most ungenerous and unfair statement. I do not believe the National Guard have come down here as a political force or have made an effort to dominate the Senate through any political means. I do know that some members of the National Guard have been here, but I believe the National Guardsmen are prompted by a spirit and a purpose as lofty and as patriotic as that of any Senator in this body. I know many of those men and I feel that the accusation is unjust and ungenerous. Those men came here because they believed the enactment of this particular bill, and particularly with section 56 in it, would tend to disintegrate and destroy their National Guard.

I will say, as I said the other day, the National Guard is an arm of great service in this country. They are not tin soldiers nor toy soldiers. It will not do to charge that on them. They are a patriotic body of men, as brave and as patriotic as any band of men who ever carried a gun. I recall very well in my own State, and I can look back far enough and recall in the State of New York and in the State of Pennsylvania when the National Guard gave infinite service to our country, infinite service to the State, and now it illy becomes Senators to talk about National Guardsmen coming down here and pressing themselves as a body, a political force, to carry out a particular measure.

I am impressed with the fact that this bill will disintegrate and destroy the National Guard. I am as much for the welfare of the country and so are these men as can be the authors of this measure. Those men have no mean or ulterior purpose to serve. They are as patriotic as we. We all realize the necessity, and you can not find a Senator in this body who is not in favor of a bill that shall better prepare our country in the hour of need. I am with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I do not believe there is a reasonable probability of our country being attacked notwithstanding the suggestions that have been advanced by the chairman of the committee. I believe we are reasonably safe, but to make assurance doubly sure I am in favor of an Army bill which shall put us beyond question in the right line as to defenses.

I urge my friends to cease this nonsense, and to my mind this injustice and unfairness, of the intimation that because one may disagree on this bill he is conspiring at the overthrow of the country for the disintegration of our armed forces. I want all to recognize that men have the right to disagree, and that those who oppose are just as patriotic, just as honest as those who advocate the measure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I shall vote against this section. Should the section fail to be stricken out, I am frank to say that I shall vote for the bill then in its entirety, though I think it would be infinitely better if the section were out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from New Jersey has flowed on past the point where I desired to make an inquiry. He said a moment ago that section 56, if enacted into law, as I understood him, would destroy the National Guard.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I said it was the belief of the National Guard. I claim no expert knowledge in military lines.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it the Senator's belief that it will destroy the National Guard?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is my fear that it would tend to disintegrate and to destroy the National Guard.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I ask the Senator a question? I am just as anxious to preserve the National Guard as is the

Senator from New Jersey, and I would do nothing consciously that would destroy it. Will the Senator from New Jersey tell us in what way the organization of this volunteer force would destroy the National Guard?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, prefacing it with what I said, that I am not an expert military man and claim to have little knowledge of matters military, it is the belief of the gentlemen who have talked with me that it would tend to disintegrate and destroy the National Guard. I think that opinion has been quite generally acquiesced in and pretty generally understood.

I have received telegrams on one side insisting that it would destroy them, and I have received some others saying that even though it did the section had better be left in. I have received them on both sides of the question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have heard some statements to the effect that the law adviser of the Army, the Judge Advocate General, had given a written opinion, and possibly several written opinions, in relation to the proposition in both the Hay and Chamberlain bills to federalize the National Guard, to state it briefly. I received this morning a letter from a very distinguished lawyer and an ex-member of the Cabinet stating that the Judge Advocate General wrote an opinion some months ago which covered the ground in relation to that subject, and that he has recently prepared another opinion regarding the provision at present under discussion. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he is in possession of those opinions or if he has seen them?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that during President Taft's administration the Adjutant General rendered an opinion holding, in substance, that the National Guard could not be so federalized as to warrant the Government in undertaking to call their services into requisition to go out of the United States. That opinion was later submitted to Attorney General Wickersham, and he concurred in that opinion. I think the Senator will find that both the opinion of Judge Advocate Gen. Crowder and Mr. Wickersham were printed either in the House hearings or in one of the documents that has been referred to during this discussion.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is there not a later opinion than that, about the plan proposed in the Senator's own bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not recall one now.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think it would be exceedingly interesting for us to know what the legal adviser of the Army may say about it, and as the Senator seems to be uncertain as to whether he has the opinion or not I will ask unanimous consent that the resolution I send to the desk may be agreed to, in case we have not the opinion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think I can find it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would like to have all the opinions that have been given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 158), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to furnish to the Senate any written opinions which the Judge Advocate General of the Army may have given concerning the project contained in the so-called Hay and Chamberlain bills, to federalize the National Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I object to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection, and it will go over one day.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will state my objection if necessary. Will the Chair let me explain the objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The opinions are already in the RECORD of both committees.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, just a moment, if the Senator from Missouri will allow me. While I was on my feet I referred to the fact that the Training Camps' Association estimated the cost for 100,000 men at \$5,000,000. I had intended, as showing how closely the committee and the association understood one another, to insert at that point that the estimate of the committee for the first year would be something like \$24,000,000. I shall take the liberty of inserting that at the appropriate place in my remarks.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota a question before he sits down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CLAPP. I do.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has stated that it is estimated that the training camp, as I understand, would cost \$2,000,000 a year for 100,000 men?

Mr. CLAPP. That was their estimate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Is not the Senator from Minnesota mistaken about that estimate having been made? If that was stated, it was because it cost them of their own money about \$2,000,000 to attend the training camp. That was the way I understood it.

Mr. CLAPP. Surely; they say that 100,000 men were there—I think there were not 100,000 men there, but a hundred thousand men might be there—my recollection is that the estimate was \$3,000,000 for a hundred thousand men.

Mr. BORAH. The estimate of this committee under section 56 is about \$24,000,000.

Mr. CLAPP. The estimate of the committee for the first year is \$24,000,000; for the second year, \$31,000,000; for the third year, \$39,000,000; for the fourth year, \$47,000,000; and annually thereafter, \$27,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. How was this difference of cost made up? What constitutes the difference? What is it that costs \$32,000,000 instead of \$2,000,000?

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator from Idaho will examine section 56, he will find that that section refers again to another act, the act of April 25, 1914, which, in turn, refers to still another act, and between the three acts there is the general experience which we have in legislation—too much sail for the amount of ballast—in other words, a great top-heavy organization.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire, in answer to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], to speak of what enters into that cost of \$24,000,000. That is not the actual cost of the men. We are accumulating all the time clothing, ordnance, and other matériel. The estimate for these things was printed in the RECORD yesterday, showing for the Quartermaster and Ordnance Departments just exactly what went into that estimate of \$24,000,000 per annum. The Government is laying aside and storing ordnance and other things that are necessary for the organization.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; and for that reason I have not stated it; but it was called out by some inquiry referring to the larger figures embracing those items. I simply referred to the figures estimated for the first year. There is not any great amount of accumulation carried on the first year, but that does account for the increased cost year after year, undoubtedly, but the first year it is \$24,000,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, let me make myself understood about that. The first year included in that estimate of \$24,000,000 they have \$3,651,000 for ordnance stores and supplies; \$1,318,000, manufacture of arms; \$744,000, automatic machine rifles; armament of fortifications B, \$9,226,000; small-arms target practice, \$120,000; making \$15,059,000 of the estimate that the Senator refers to. Practically all of that goes into the reserve.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I am somewhat confused about this matter of cost, in view of the various statements that have been made. What, in the opinion of the chairman of the committee, will it cost the Government of the United States to organize and train, under section 56, a volunteer force of, say, 100,000 men per annum?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know that I could give the cost for a hundred thousand men; but if the Senator will take the estimates of cost that have been referred to, it is proposed by this voluntary system to eventually raise about 261,000 men.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What will it cost?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And those men are raised in increments of one-fourth for four years, so that the final annual cost, as contained in these estimates, is the cost of the full force at the end of the fourth year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And what is that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is \$27,609,067.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Per annum?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; assuming that the enlistments would number 261,000 and were trained for 30 days.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At any rate that sum would take care of a volunteer reserve force of 261,000 men?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir; decreasing from the fourth year, because during the first, second, and third years much of this money is expended—and that is the reason the cost is large—in the accumulation of equipment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me now ask the Senator what would be the amount of contribution upon the part of the

Government toward the training and equipping of a corresponding number of the National Guard?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Under table 11, of cost—and I will say that that has been criticized by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE]—under the estimates we have here it is \$40,873,200 annually after the fourth year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For the same number of men?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. For practically the same number.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, it would cost the Federal Government, in addition to what may be spent by the States, if I understand the matter, in the neighborhood of \$12,000,000 more per annum for the same number of troops of the National Guard than it would for this contemplated volunteer reserve force. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The difference in the annual cost amounts to a little over \$13,000,000 after the fourth year.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. What is done for the National Guard that makes it cost the Government more to maintain 260,000 of the National Guard than to maintain 260,000 of the volunteers?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Their training covers a longer period; of course that is one element of cost; but it is perfectly fair to say here, Mr. President, that, in making the estimate of the cost of the National Guard, we have estimated in that, as a part of the expense, the accumulation of the same material and supplies. The difference in pay alone is about thirteen or fourteen million dollars.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood the Senator from Oregon to say yesterday, possibly, that the training of the volunteers was substantially the same in point of time as would be the training given the National Guard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But it is condensed into a 30-day period, whilst the members of the National Guard are trained in the armories each week and spend 24 days in camp.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the volunteers must be trained 30 days every year?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. To me it is utterly inconceivable—and I know there must be a very serious mistake somewhere; not made, of course, by the Senator from Oregon—that it should be asserted that you can maintain 260,000 volunteers, with their officers, at a cost of \$24,000,000, while it costs \$45,000,000 or \$40,000,000 to aid the National Guard to maintain the same number of troops. I repeat there must be a mistake somewhere in that estimate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I can not, of course, undertake to correct the figures that have been furnished us from the different branches of the War Department. I only take the figures which they gave us; that is all the committee could do. The Senator will find them very carefully compiled throughout.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, if he will turn to the figures giving the cost of the National Guard and the cost of the volunteers, he will find that the expense of the Quartermaster Corps of the National Guard is placed at \$17,000,000, \$20,000,000, \$21,000,000, \$23,000,000, and \$24,000,000. There does not seem to be any charge on a similar scale in connection with the volunteer service, unless new equipment and the 30 days' training is considered under it. I find that items for new equipment and training are also embraced in the estimates for the National Guard. That quartermaster's charge, which seems to be very large, amounting to half of the total estimate as to the National Guard, does not seem to be found to an equal extent in the estimate given as to the cost of the volunteers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I can furnish the Senator the estimates from the quartermaster's department showing the exact figures. The difference principally lies in the estimate for the pay of the two forces.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The expense of maintaining the volunteer force is paid in the same way, for the same amount of service, as in the case of the Regulars, is it not? In other words, when a man joins the volunteer force his traveling expenses are paid going to and returning from the camp to his home. Is not that correct?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it covers both.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And he is equipped, clothed, ~~and~~, given a hat, and all that, as the Regulars are, is he not?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment. I want very briefly to discuss this avalanche of telegrams. They were presented this morning in such bulk as to appear not only to be formidable but ominous. They were presented by the chairman of the committee in one bundle and by the Senator

from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] in another. I presume they were handed to us as evidence of a spontaneous uprising on behalf of the people in favor of section 56. At the same time we have heard criticized on the floor of the Senate the National Guard because members of that organization have seen fit to write letters and send telegrams urging legislation which would preserve the National Guard from destruction.

Before I discuss these telegrams I want to say a word lest I should be misunderstood. I hold that all citizens of the United States not only have the right, but it may in some instances become their duty, to send their views to their Representatives or Senators in Congress. When one receives the views of a great number of men scattered throughout his State or the country, each really expressive of the opinion of the sender, the fact at once appeals to every man who is a fit representative of the people; but in these latter days it has become the custom for some central organization to get up a propaganda and to send out to the members of an organization or association a request to deluge Congress with letters or telegrams. Generally the sender is told what he is to say, and ordinarily I think the suggestion is accompanied with the caution, "Please do not copy this exact language." So we generally find an attempt is made to vary the language.

Mr. President, I have gone through this great bundle of telegrams which were filed here by the chairman of the committee and I undertake to say that I can impanel a jury, and let him pick the 12 men, and I can prove that 90 per cent of these telegrams emanated from one common source. I can prove it by the language of the telegrams themselves. So that, instead of representing a general opinion that is entertained throughout the country, the telegrams in fact represent the opinion of some propagandist who has a special interest in section 56, either patriotic or otherwise.

Let me give you a few illustrations. Here is a telegram from Baltimore:

As a member of the first training regiment, United States military camp—

Now, note the language which follows—

I protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56, Senate bill, and urge immediate passage of this section.

Here is one from Boston:

As a member of Plattsburg training regiment, I protest against attempt to defeat Federal reserve plan in section 56 of Senate bill and emphatically urge passage of this section.

Of course, Boston being an intellectual center, this may have been a case of thought transmission. But here is another telegram from Boston in exactly the same language as the one I just read, and here is another one from Baltimore in exactly the same language as the first telegram I read, and here is another one from Boston in exactly the same language, and still another from Boston in the same language, and still another. Then here is a telegram from Boston that changes the language by inserting the word "vigorously," so that this gentleman "vigorously protests." And here is one from Brooklyn. Now, nobody would expect Brooklyn to be so keenly attuned to mysterious intellectual processes that it would catch this vibration that is going through the air, but the gentleman from Brooklyn caught it nearly right. He substituted the word "emphatically" for "vigorously," but otherwise he caught the Boston-Baltimore language. So I can go through the lot. This is one class and one kind of language. Then there is another class, which is typified by this telegram from Pittsfield, Mass.:

Please work to put through the Federal reserve plan embodied in section 56 of the Senate bill.

And there are seven telegrams from that same town in exactly the same phraseology.

Mr. President, here are about 30 telegrams which display a somewhat bungling attempt to vary the language. They come from Philadelphia, from Cambridge, Mass., from New York City, from Auburn, N. Y., and four or five other places. They are what we might call the "strongly urge" telegrams. One of them reads:

Strongly urge passage of section 56 in Senate bill relating to Army. Do not permit its defeat.

That comes from Philadelphia; but here comes one from Cambridge:

I strongly urge passage.

Just the pronoun "I" put in, which is quite a natural thing to expect in a message from Cambridge.

But here is a gentleman from New York who uses all of the language, except he puts in the word "I emphatically urge."

And so, running through some 30 telegrams, they are as plainly from one source as though they had been written in one handwriting or upon one typewriter and one kind of paper.

Here are about 50 telegrams. They come from Boston, and they come from Princeton, and they come from Brooklyn, but principally from Boston. There are, however, some from other towns. While they vary slightly in their language, all of them have substantially this sentence:

Strongly protest against defeat of section 56 of the Senate bill, embodying Federal reserve plan.

That sentence, substantially, appears in every one of them.

And so I might go through with all the telegrams comprising the great pile filed this morning. I should by so doing weary the Senate; I content myself by remarking that it is perfectly manifest, from an examination of these telegrams, that over 90 per cent of them, if not 99 per cent of them, emanated from one common source.

I simply say what I have so that nobody will think there is any great uprising indicated by these numerous messages. The charge has been made that the National Guard, because a few letters have been written in, is engaged in a lobby. Here is the positive, absolute, physical evidence in the Senate that the organization which went into camp at Plattsburg is engaged in a most vigorous and concerted attempt to influence legislation. I do not complain of it, but I do not want to hear the cry of "wolf" any more from gentlemen who represent that particular idea.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I think the telegrams and letters that are sent to Members of Congress are either from motives of patriotism or pelf. I have no objection whatever to a member of the National Guard of my State or any other States giving me his honest opinion as to the value of the National Guard to the general plan of our Army. I do not object to anybody giving me an idea or a fact, but I do not care to hear from any one who has a pecuniary interest in the matter of legislation. I have received a telegram such as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has just read.

Now, if this great Army is to be organized I have no objection to a volunteer force at all. I have no objection to these camps in the summer time for the purpose of training men in the use of arms, and teaching them the lessons of war. I think, however, the toilers of the country can ill-afford to bear the burden of taxation incident thereto at this time. Personally, I had hoped that all of this great plan, the organization of the Army and the building of a Navy, might be postponed until after the war in Europe is over, so as to permit the American people to survey the situation and organize an Army and build a Navy to meet all the exigencies and the necessities of the future. And I think that probably would have been done but for the energetic efforts on the part of those who are largely interested in the profits derived from the manufacture of munitions of war. Manifestly this Congress is not going to take the course which I would dictate or prescribe had I the power, but on the contrary, I am afraid it is going to undertake to lay the foundation of a great system—to build a house, as it were, when the flames are leaping heavenward and the storm is raging furiously about us.

That such a structure, whose foundation is laid under such circumstances, will meet the demands of the future, if we shall do our duty as a Christian Nation and the civilized peoples of the earth shall show themselves capable of self-government, I have my serious doubts.

My especial objection to section 56 is rather local in its nature. I am opposed to the whole scheme at this time, but the peculiar bearing it has upon the affairs of Mississippi means the local question of paramount importance. I pointed out certain provisions in the section a day or two ago which vitally affect the people of the State from which I come. My purpose in calling attention to the objectionable provisions of section 56 was purely patriotic. My only desire in the matter was to serve the people of Mississippi and America. But, notwithstanding my motive, I notice in the RECORD that my warnings and suggestions have been made the subject of ridicule by a distinguished Member of this body.

I want to say, Mr. President, that there is no argument in epithets, no reason in ridicule; and satire in the discussion of a serious question is the refuge of the intellectual bandit.

In the consideration of this great question the calmest, most serious consideration should be given to every provision of this bill. When I said that under the terms of section 56 there might be organized in the State of Mississippi a camp to which the negroes of that State would be invited, I did not say that that would be done. God forbid that there should ever come to the White House a man so utterly regardless of the interests of the people of America as to do such a thing. But this is an age of change. Marvelous changes have taken place in recent years. Things are happening to-day that we did not dream two years ago could possibly happen. I do not know

what is going to happen in the coming years. But I do know that the race question is in the South, and that it is of overshadowing, paramount importance there.

When it is suggested that such a thing is impossible, that the laboring negroes of Mississippi could not leave their farms to go to one of these camps, I want to say in reply that in the little city of Jackson, where I live, if such a camp were organized, either in Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, or anywhere else in the South, more than a regiment would, in my judgment, go from that one little city of Jackson alone, robust, vigorous negro men, who do nothing, who toil not, neither do they spin, but rather live by the hand-outs from their women employed in the homes of the white families—and if such a proposition were made to them they would flock to it like carrion crows around a carcass. There could be a camp organized in the State of Mississippi, by advertising it for 60 days, of 25,000; and the Senators from the other sections of this Republic do not know what that means to the people of Mississippi. Oh, I am not saying this in order to generate race prejudice or to advertise our own unfortunate conditions; not at all. I would to God that conditions were different, that the peril might be removed from our midst.

It was stated upon the floor of the Senate yesterday:

Suppose a lot of darkies went into Hinds County, to a so-called Plattsburg drill, as a voluntary force of some sort, and, with arms in their hands, began to be disciplined, so that in the opinion of the white people of the State they became a source of menace to white civilization, what would happen to those volunteer darkies? Echo answers, "What?"

Of course, I know what would happen, and what I know would happen, is the very thing that I do not want to happen. No man knows the difficulties in handling the affairs of a Southern State when the two races conflict, who has not served in the capacity in which I served for four years as governor. You Senators from States where you have not that problem at all read in your newspapers nearly every morning accounts of some unfortunate crime that has been committed in South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas; and what is the result? Mobbing. What is the effect of mobbing upon those who mob? I care not what the provocation may be; I do not care what crime may lead to the mobbing; the white man who participates in it, though he does it to protect his home, to preserve the peace and purity of his wife and daughters—that man who violates the law when he takes it in his own hands suffers a moral deterioration from which he will never recover; and if that thing is persisted in very long, it will destroy the very civilization which we of the South are trying to conserve. There is no doubt about that.

Now, if, for political reasons or any other reasons, with an utter disregard of the real interests not only of the southern people but all the American people—because whatever injures the South, hurts the entire Republic—any President should order a mobilization of negro troops in Mississippi or any other Southern State, keep them there for 30 days, clothe and equip them, and then send them back with all the airs they have acquired in 30 days of drill, only one who understands the nature of the Negro and his peculiarities generally would know what would follow.

But the distinguished Senator intimated that the negroes have no money to attend the camp. Under the terms of this bill, the United States Government furnishes the money to pay for transportation and general equipment. Every negro would take it as a very delightful summer outing, and if an effort should be made to bring them to the service of the United States as a part of the Army, I apprehend it would not be the least trouble to organize as large an army as the Government would be willing to pay for.

Mr. President, I would much rather take my chances without any preparation whatever to meet a foreign foe, relying upon the individual white citizen and the patriotic spirit of the men of America to defend the flag and repel any foreign invasion, than to submit to the enactment of a law of this character, which exposes the people of the South to a peril as far-reaching as the adoption of section 56. I shall therefore vote to strike that section from the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have taken no part in this discussion, beyond asking a question occasionally, having been much more anxious to vote than to talk, feeling, as I do, that there is great urgency for the speedy passage of this bill; and I am only going to take a few minutes to-day to present my views on one or two phases of the controversy that has been raging in the Senate Chamber for a week.

I am in favor of retaining section 56 in the bill as it stands, and shall so vote. I have not heard from a single member of the National Guard of my State—and we have a very efficient National Guard in New Hampshire—either for or against the

section that is under discussion, so that I am not at all influenced by anything that comes from the National Guard in reference to this matter, an organization that I am very friendly to.

I want to say, Mr. President—and I say it in all kindness, because I am not in favor of legislation that will do harm to any section of the country—that I deprecate very much the raising of the race issue in the consideration of this bill. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] a few days ago raised that issue in very plain terms, declaring that, so far as the colored man was concerned, if he had his way he would not allow him to be a soldier of the United States but would keep him in a menial position, and the Senator from Mississippi has just repeated substantially the same thing. Of course, the Senator is entitled to that view, and every other Senator is entitled to a different view if he himself holds it. Speaking for myself, I want to express in a very few words my dissent from the position that the junior Senator from Mississippi has taken. And in this connection, so that the RECORD may be right, I want to say that the Senator whom the junior Senator from Mississippi criticized a few moments ago is not a member of the Republican Party and does not sit on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, I believe I speak for the entire Republican membership of this body when I say that we have no disposition to raise the race issue. We recognize it as a very serious problem with which another section of the country has to deal, and we are content to have it worked out as best it can be; notwithstanding we dissent from some of the methods that have been used in some of the Southern States. I say, Mr. President, I deprecate the raising of the race issue in this debate, and I have called attention to the circumstances under which it has been raised.

If I have read history aright, Mr. President, the colored man made a good soldier in the Civil War. He fought for the Union, for the Constitution, and for the flag, and he fought valiantly. If I read history aright, the colored man was a good soldier in the Spanish-American War, and he never has been given the credit that belongs to him for the work he did during that struggle. I also notice, Mr. President, that only a few days ago it was colored troopers who attacked and defeated a portion of the army of the bandit Villa; and they fought then as they have frequently fought before, bravely and valiantly. Whenever put to the test the colored soldier has acquitted himself honorably.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the time may come when the loyal colored men may be needed to protect our country from invasion and defend the liberties of our people, and I should hesitate to put myself on record as saying that those men should in an emergency of that kind be denied the privilege of fighting for their country.

The political rights of the colored man have been seriously abridged and he tamely submits to what he feels is a great injustice; but notwithstanding that, he is willing to fight for his country, and to me it is inconceivable that any man should attempt to deny him that right if he wishes to exercise it.

Mr. President, I beg of Senators not to allow their minds to be beclouded in any way by the race issue, which, in my judgment, has no proper place in this discussion. The provisions of section 56 should be considered and decided from a purely military point of view, and from no other point. Believing, as I do, that section 56 is one of the most important provisions of the bill, I shall vote against striking it out, and I trust that the motion of the Senator from Maryland may not be agreed to.

I desire simply to add a single word. It seems to me this section has been sufficiently discussed. It seems to me that we ought to be content with the time that has been spent in its discussion, and that we ought to come to a speedy vote. I appeal to Senators, whatever their views may be as to this section or as to any other provision of this important bill, that they may bring their minds to the conclusion which I have reached, and that we may not spend much more time in the discussion of a matter that is perfectly well understood by every Senator on both sides of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to section 56 as reported by the committee.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has just stated that this question should be approached from the standpoint of military reasons. The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has said that we should consider this question from the standpoint of the interests of the country as a whole. With both these general statements I agree.

Mr. President, preparedness must be practical, preparedness must be sane; it should be efficient, and should be economical. This particular section, section 56, in my judgment should be eliminated from the bill by the Senate and more than the equivalent provided for in other ways. I do not believe preparedness is going to gain any time by leaving section 56 in the bill. It has already been voted on in the House. It was proposed by Mr. GARDNER, of Massachusetts, as an amendment to the House bill, and received so little support that he did not even ask for a division. The Senate, however—this vote may turn out by one or two majority when it is actually taken—is quite equally divided on the question. The House of Representatives, therefore, being against it overwhelmingly and the Senate of the United States being divided, under ordinary conditions is there any prospect that section 56 can be agreed to in conference?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I think the Senator has not a right under our rules to attempt to influence the judgment of the Senate by alluding to what has happened in the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the Senate must settle this question from its own view and not from the view of the House of Representatives, and that it is not a legitimate argument to attempt to influence the Senate by the action of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have said on that subject all I wished to say, at any rate, and I spoke of it simply as a practical man dealing with a practical question. I look at it from the standpoint of the military considerations which the Senator from New Hampshire just now referred to. I want preparedness, effective preparedness, and at the earliest possible time, and I do not wish to see any unnecessary delays thrown in the path of the preparation of a genuine citizen soldiery for the defense of the country.

Mr. President, is there no presumption in favor of the Constitution of the United States? If a man stands on this floor and argues in favor of the citizen soldiery mentioned in the Constitution, of the citizen soldiery approved of by Gen. Washington time and again, is he not entitled to the benefit of being in accord with the fundamental law and the greatest military leader of our country? Gen. Washington described the citizen soldiery as "the palladium of our security, the first effectual resort in case of hostility." Speaking of the militia, those were his words. No man had more trouble with unorganized and undisciplined militia than he had.

We all here are or have been members of the militia when between the age of 18 and the age of 45, as are all citizens; and yet relatively few of the citizens of this country know they are in the militia as a matter of law. Such as these unorganized, undisciplined militia are what Gen. Washington alluded to whenever he did speak in terms of condemnation of militia. Such a force is of necessity unreliable from a military standpoint, and should not be entrusted with the defense of our country and our institutions.

But an organized army, a disciplined militia, provided for under section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, is an altogether different story. I can not help thinking as we read over and talk over that section that it is one of the most remarkable expressions of wisdom in that great instrument, showing the practical ability, the theoretical knowledge of the men who made our Constitution, balancing the locality against the central government; and the balance of the Constitution is one of its greatest characteristics. It lies in the fundamental division of a government, legislative, judicial, and executive, all of those great features being features of balance for the preservation of liberty without in the least degree affecting the efficiency of the Government operating under the system. I want to discuss in a few moments the provisions of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, but pass on now to a preliminary fact that for 100 years or more of the history of this country there has been a persistent and successful organized effort to defeat the full and effective exercise of the powers of Congress over the citizen soldiery prescribed in the Constitution. Congress has largely failed to exercise its right to organize, arm, and discipline the militia during all this period. The opponents of the action recommended by President after President, from Washington almost to the present day, used the present constitutional doubts and the present military insinuations against citizen soldiers.

Practically there was a lack of money, and also, as it is alleged, the ambitions of the Regular Army personnel interfered very largely with the possibility of developing a disciplined and permanently officered citizen soldiery.

That is one of the things that I want to bring to the attention of the Senate. Take this volunteer system. It necessarily is a confused condition whenever inaugurated to protect the country in an emergency. Volunteers hastily gather. Where would the officers come from? Certainly all the leading officers would come from the established personnel of the Regular Army. When appropriations were small and when opportunities of advancing the legitimate ambitions of military men were rare, there was perhaps more excuse in such an opposition, but now when the Congress is on the verge of increasing the Regular Army to 200,000 or to 250,000, when a large part of the captains will be majors and when many of the majors will be colonels by this very increase, the time has passed when anything like military jealousy on the part of the Regular personnel should be considered for a moment or respected for a moment in dealing with this great question of militia preparedness.

Congress has been largely under the influence for a long time of some kind of prejudice with reference to the militia of this country. I have been surprised sitting here in the last few days to hear the criticism coming from the old Members of this body of the alleged inefficiency and lack of discipline of the National Guard of the country.

Mr. President, if the finest young officers leaving West Point, furnished by the Government with their education, furnished with the pay that would support them, furnished with their clothing and their outfit, were told to go out and raise an army and discipline an army and at the same time Congress told those highly educated young officers, who would not have to take the time to make a living, that it would not pay any wages to that army, what sort of an army could those young men raise and maintain?

And yet, Mr. President, though Congress has for the last 10 years or more been paying something to the militia in the way of clothing and equipment, it has provided no wages to the National Guard soldiers except the wages of 50 cents a day, I believe, for some maneuvers. All this time what has been going on? A patriotic body of men, the officers and men of the National Guard of this country, have been giving of their time and of their substance to create and maintain and keep together a body of fairly disciplined soldiers that now amounts in numbers to 134,000 men, without pay for the rank and file, all losing their time, and the officers having to make up to the National Government for the clothing or other equipment individual soldiers might lose. The captain of an ordinary infantry company in the National Guard is responsible for between \$4,000 and \$5,000 worth of property to the United States, and necessarily some of that property is lost in various ways, but he, though commanding men who receive practically no pay from the country they protect, is compelled to make good out of his own pocket all the losses that occur.

The small amount that is provided for by this bill will revolutionize that situation. The \$52.50 a year that the bill carries for the national guardsman will be a recognition, at least, and by preventing a total loss of the time devoted to the country will stimulate men to attend the periods of drill and will give a money sum against which the losses may be set-off. This pay, small as it is, will go a long way toward increasing the efficiency and discipline of the National Guard in this country.

Yet Senator after Senator who has sat in this body through years and years and who has never raised his hand to give the present proposed pay of \$52.50 a year to the National Guardsman has risen in his place in the Senate and commented on what he alleged to be their lack of discipline.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that a man who had been in this body for any length of time and concurred in failure to exercise the powers of Congress to discipline the militia would be ashamed to rise in his place and point to the unpreparedness of this country in respect to the very matter that he himself has so long neglected.

Yet, Mr. President, almost every gentleman here who has criticized what he alleges to be the lack of discipline in the National Guard attempts at the same time to excuse himself on general constitutional grounds.

But how about the Constitution in respect to paying the guard? Is there any constitutional difficulty or objection to paying the National Guard? Is there any constitutional objection to this \$52.50 a year? There is no such objection, and every man in this body knows that such a provision will operate as it is claimed it will operate. Here is an obvious improvement for possible discipline, free from constitutional doubt, and yet the critics of the National Guard have held it back throughout these years.

The Senator from New York suggested doubt as to what might happen if the courts found that any of these improving provi-

sions were unconstitutional. It will be time enough when that decision is arrived at. But why has not the National Guard been paid before? How can any man who has been here and has had the opportunity of years and who has not made a record in the struggle for the payment of the National Guard even for the small wage of \$52.50 a year, rise in his seat here and point the finger of criticism at what he alleges to be a lack of discipline? Congress has failed to organize and to arm and to discipline, and the words of the Constitution say that Congress shall provide for those things.

Mr. President, I do not know where we would look if we were looking for the men who failed to do this thing. I do not want to be invidious, but the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] yesterday, when we were discussing a question of military policy as for or against section 56, criticized us all who are opposed to section 56, as though we were opposed to the preparation of this country for a legitimate and proper defense against an invading foe.

He suggested that we were practically against preparedness. I resent that suggestion, because I believe that we who stand for the use of the National Guard, for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia of this country, as recommended by Gen. Washington, as provided in the Constitution, are the fundamental and sane friends of preparedness.

There is a great advantage, certainly at the beginning, a great money advantage, in favor of the guardsman over the volunteer. The first year's financial advantage, referring to table 12 in the report of the committee, can be found by correcting table 12, first year's estimate, by deducting \$19,000,000 from that first year's cost, a sum which has been already spent and represents accumulated material now in the hands of the National Guard of this country, and then dividing the remaining sum by 153,000 guardsmen, the number for whom the estimates are now annually made, the minimum enlisted number as provided by law. This gives us \$176 per man as the annual cost of the United States of the individual guardsman, whereas the first year's cost as given by the committee for the 56,829 men and officers of the volunteers, in its first-year column, is \$439 per man. The difference in favor of the guardsman, then, for the first year's cost is the difference between \$439 and \$176, that difference being in favor of the National Guardsman.

In addition to all that, the National Guardsman has a provision of between one and two hundred million dollars—I think I am safe in saying it is nearer two than one—of armories, military homes, where their clothing, equipment, and arms can be kept; where they can drill in bad weather, in addition to the outside drills which are provided for under this proposed law. The guardsman also has the advantage of the annual appropriations of the State; my State, for instance, appropriating \$90,000 annually for the upkeep of the Guard in addition to having provided considerable investments in armories throughout the State. In this connection it is proper to add that out of the total of some 2,200 only 40 men were absent at the last inspection of the National Guard in Maryland.

But this volunteer army, so called, this so-called continental army, is a homeless body even if it can be brought to exist. Places for it to gather and keep its equipment, to issue forth from for the various purposes of military activity, are not yet provided or even estimated for by the committee.

It is remarkable, Mr. President, with these financial advantages in favor of the National Guardsman, that the committee should have gone out of its way to bring into this law a competing and, as I think, an unnecessary force. When I use the word "competing," I do not mean a force that by proper competition will improve the other, but I mean a force that gives an opportunity for all of the ancient enemies of the citizen soldiery of this country to discriminate in favor of the highly centralized force as against the citizen soldiery so carefully provided by the Constitution.

Mr. President, the committee can not be even moderately friendly to the National Guard, because if they wanted more men they could simply have increased the numbers and added that 50,000 to the National Guard, and added it as I have just shown with great economy to the Treasury of the United States, and greater promptness and certainty for the common defense.

In this connection I want to read you a little colloquy that took place in the Committee on Military Affairs between several Senators. I will just read the colloquy without the names. A Senator—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Read the names. It is a public record.

Mr. LEE of Maryland (reading):

A SENATOR. It has always seemed to me, although I have never been able to figure it out, that limitations can be placed upon these

appropriations by the Federal Government that would compel the National Guard to yield to Federal control.

ANOTHER SENATOR. That could be done as a condition to the appropriation and the method of its use.

The FIRST SENATOR. That is what I am getting at.

The SECOND SENATOR. But would such a statute be in harmony with the provisions of the Constitution upon that subject?

The FIRST SENATOR. Suppose in making an appropriation for the National Guard, for instance, it is optional with Congress to make that or not. Suppose you make an appropriation conditioned upon the National Guard of all the States obeying the regulations adopted by the Secretary of War.

The SECOND SENATOR. The regulation would not be effective unless the States agreed to it.

A THIRD SENATOR. Would not that do away with the National Guard?

The SECOND SENATOR. It would have that effect, ultimately, and I am inclined to think that if it should have that effect it would be a good thing.

A good thing, Mr. President, to do away ultimately with the citizen soldiery of the Constitution of the United States! But the fact is that the National Guard will increase and improve, however recognized, by reason of the innate ability and patriotism of its members.

The Assistant Secretary of War, testifying before the Military Committee of the Senate, said, among other things, that 90 per cent of the men in the National Guard were there with reference to national defense, and, according to his estimate, a large per cent of the Guard might go into the Garrison volunteer system which was then being pushed.

Mr. President, I would not fear such disintegration very much did I not feel that there has been throughout the history of the long struggle for preparedness in this country a persistent prejudice in military circles against completely organizing the militia of this country; but I can not help thinking that Congress may lay the foundation for a possible failure to discipline the Organized Militia when it gives the two bodies places side by side and puts the management and possibly the destiny of the two in the hands of a personnel that may lean to the centralized force and may be adverse not only to the citizen soldiery specified in the Constitution but to all citizen soldiery.

Mr. President, I was a little surprised here this morning. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] yesterday was full of indignation, and his voice showed unusual feeling for a man of such remarkable self-command, when he denounced the national guardsmen of this country for undertaking to communicate with their representatives in the Senate on this occasion. I think the Senator from Oregon went so far as to say that, if the communicating on the part of the National Guard with this body did not stop, he was for cutting it up root and branch, financially, I presume. To-day the Senator has been reading telegrams from a few National Guardsmen who favor his view, and I want to congratulate him on the increased liberality which he has to-day shown to that estimable military force. I hope that he will always maintain that attitude and will modify his attitude of yesterday, for I believe—and I think he will so believe when he thinks it over—that all of the citizens of this country can communicate properly to us here their opinions upon public questions pending in the Senate.

The long telegram which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] sent to the desk and had read is an appropriate telegram for us to consider. It shows that the Military Training Camps Association is operating in this matter and that mistaken opinions may have been disseminated about section 56 and the effect of striking it out, all of which could very easily have been started by misinformation sent by somebody to this camp association, which is in close touch, as it says in its telegram, with 30,000 citizens, and presumably has gotten as many of those citizens to telegraph the Senate as were willing to undergo the expense.

Those 30,000 citizens, according to this telegram, are going to pay \$2,000,000 for a military educational course this summer. I want to say that I have great respect for their patriotism; I am glad that they are going to do it; but the very fact that they are able to contribute \$66 each out of their private means for this purpose, as well as the length of time that is involved, shows very clearly that they belong to a class of the wealthier citizens of the country. But why not have these summer camps and military drill as members of the National Guard? This can easily be done without section 56 and a much greater military movement secured.

Mr. President, that is the very thing in this whole section 56 to which I am opposed. I do not believe we should create a separate military citizen-soldiery system. I think that these young men who are showing so much segregated patriotism ought to be encouraged to follow the flag alongside of their brethren in a really large movement. I think it would be better for them in the long run; it would be better for the country and better for their associates if they join the National Guard as guardsmen and follow the flag of their country as the soldiers

of Switzerland do, let us say, each man on an equal footing with his neighbor. Let them live together in patriotism. They may have to die together.

This segregation into a special military force is undemocratic and undesirable, especially, Mr. President, in view of the fact that all this military training can be equally well and better done through the instrumentalities of National Guard maneuvers and encampments. There is not a particle of this training that can not be given in that way if these gentlemen want to get it, and they need not spend \$66 apiece to segregate themselves from their fellow citizens. They can get it all, and they ought to get it all, at the hands of our Military Committee and be freely and sufficiently furnished with proper instruction under United States inspector instructors. It ought to be one great movement; it ought not to be a volunteer system and a militia system, conflicting one with the other; but it ought to be one great organized militia system, all mobilized at the same time and all mobilized under similar conditions.

Mobilization, Mr. President, implies uniformity. This division of military preparedness into small subdivisions is bad military policy, creating special types here and special bodies there with different relationships to national defense. Gen. Washington struggled for uniformity, and the words that I have quoted from him are connected with a plea for uniformity.

It is essential, therefore—

Said Gen. Washington on June 8, 1783, in addressing the governors of the Colonies—

that the same system should pervade the whole; that the formation and discipline of the militia of the continent should be absolutely uniform.

Here was the great Father of his Country pleading for uniformity, pleading for equality, pleading for similar efficiency, pleading against a segregation of the military and patriotic youth of the country into smaller subdivisions and under specially formed methods of discipline. He continues:

And that the same species of arms, accouterments, and military apparatus should be introduced in every part of the United States.

Why, Mr. President, we have got that. Thank Heaven, Congress has gone that far. It has clothed the soldier with a uniform in the National Guard; it has given him a musket, and given necessary other equipment to the National Guard—artillery, and so forth—similar apparatus to that used by the Regular Army.

As calling attention to the state of mind of some of the older Senators in this body, I would particularly refer to some of the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE]; and I regret that he is not now in the Chamber. Speaking of the present regulations, I presume, on April 4—page 5415 of the RECORD—he said that, in order for the National Guard to get the Federal pay under existing law, it was required that "there should be 24 drills of 1½ hours each and 5 days in camp." Was that any basis of criticism of the National Guard? Who is responsible for that small number of hours of drill? Who is any more responsible for there being only five days in camp than is the Senator from Massachusetts?

The Senator from Massachusetts may have made an effort to improve this condition—I hope he did; it would be to his credit if he had done so—but why should he ignore what this bill proposes to do much more? Why should he make a comparison under the old law with reference to the militia, for which he himself may be largely responsible, and not with what it is proposed to do under this bill or a better? If the provisions of the House bill are followed, 48 drills of an hour and a half each are provided for, which is 72 hours; 15 days in camp, at 10 hours a day, make 150 hours, or 222 hours as the minimum annual drill time for the National Guard, under the provisions of the House bill. The House gives only 15 days in maneuver camps; but the bill which the Senate committee reports would give a very much longer time for drilling in summer to the National Guard, as it provides 24 days in camp for the National Guard.

I do not believe that 24 days is practicable; I do not believe that at the rates of pay offered by this bill it will be possible for the citizen soldiery of this country, the men who have homes and families, to leave those homes and to abandon temporarily the support of their families, as in many cases they would have to do, on a soldier's pay of 50 cents a day. I believe that the provision of the House bill in that respect is more practicable than is the Senate bill, and that, if anything, the pay for the citizen soldier who is responsible in his community and responsible for the support of his family should be made somewhere nearly equal to his average earnings when at home.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming presented that telegram from the Military Training Camps Association, and it was

entitled to consideration; but I want to say right here that the officers of the National Guard and the men of the National Guard, year after year, decade after decade, have been contributing their time and their money, without compensation and in amounts compared to which this small amount of money to be expended by these gentlemen going to the camps is utterly trivial. I do not think, therefore, that it lies in the mouth of any Member of this body to criticize any member of the National Guard of this country for coming here, for being interested in preparation, for presenting his views in connection with advancing the preparation for defense, about which he has not been a mere talker, but in favor of which he has acted so honestly and so earnestly and with so much expense to himself.

Mr. President, I really believe that our Regular Army needs a little shaking up somewhere; I believe it needs a little extension of military public opinion, of the military knowledge of this country, such as would be created from increasing the numbers and improving the discipline of the National Guard, for instance. Our Regular Army is extremely slow to act in some respects. I think the Military Committee of the Senate, which has been charged with the burden of preparedness through many years, and which is as much responsible for our present condition as any other body of men in the country, ought to have the advantage of more alacrity, broader recommendations, and more genuine suggestion of preparedness from the higher officers of the Army.

In this connection it is proper to give two instances which I think throw a little light on this situation—personal experiences of my own. In May, 1914, I introduced a resolution. I had been thinking over the military situation and the situation in Mexico. It occurred to me that if we went into Mexico—a possibility which did come about very recently—that water and transportation would be the things the troops would especially need. I introduced a resolution on that subject, and it was sent to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, requested to prepare and bring in a bill for defining the duty and conferring the power and means upon some part of the Supply Corps of the United States Army to enlist the necessary men of proper mechanical skill and to acquire the necessary pipe, tools, pumping engines, well-boring machinery, auto trucks, and other transportation for promptly securing and distributing water supplies for drinking and washing purposes to United States troops in time of war or when war may be considered possible; and that the object of said bill should be to authorize all necessary details of officers from the Engineer Corps and Medical Corps and to use all available mechanical means in the hands of a disciplined and efficient service to create and keep a good water supply as near to the front as conditions render possible, and for which purpose the present contract system for Army water supply is obviously inadequate; and that the said general purpose of said bill may be connected, if feasible, with increased facilities for the distribution of ammunition and food and water to advanced forces.

What became of that resolution? I presume it slumbers to-day on the files of the Military Committee; but, it has been stated in the papers—and with apparent truth—that when this movement into Mexico took place the other day the Army was without water tanks to send along with the men, and that the Standard Oil Co., out of its abundant means, had permitted our little Army to have six automobile water tanks which the Standard Oil Co. was just then providing for its purposes. This special subject had been called to the attention of the Military Committee, and possibly by them to the supply corps of the United States Army, in May, 1914, and yet the United States Army, moving a few thousand men into Mexico, has to accept automobile water tanks from the Standard Oil Co.!

Mr. President, there is another little incident to which I desire to refer. I happened to be in the Military Committee one day when an officer was testifying. I never saw him before, but he would make an impression upon any observer as being a man of force and an officer of unusual attainments. After the members of the committee were through questioning him the chairman, with great courtesy, permitted me to ask him a couple of questions, and I asked him about the contest that is now going on along the whole European front between guns of fixed position and guns of concealed position. The great military struggle in Europe to-day is being determined in large part by this contest between the concealed great guns of position, for the fixed positions are abandoned. Col. Glenn, in answer to that question, filed a brochure dealing with the question of guns of concealed position, which is a part of the testimony taken by the Military Committee of the Senate. In that brochure he showed the very great utility of great movable and hidden guns; for the struggle now is between the eyesight of the flying forces and the skill of the men who handle the big guns. The big guns are concealed in every sort of position. They are placed under houses, placed behind hills, placed in little pieces of timber, placed wherever they can be concealed from the spying eye of the flying forces of the adversary. On either hand there is a

tunnel leading from the gun to a dugout, and the artillerists handling a gun, whenever the enemy find where that gun is and commence to shell it, disappear like prairie dogs in these two side tunnels, and after the bombardment is over they come out and take what is left of their gun at night and put it in a new place.

That is the process going on in this war with reference to great guns. Col. Glenn testified that the great guns of fixed position in the fortress of Verdun had been removed by the French and hidden behind the fortress in concealed positions. I state this to prepare you for the letter I am about to read; and I hope the chairman of the Military Committee will not leave the Chamber, because I think this is a significant little circumstance that surely ought not to miss his attention. Here we are, 16 months after Liege and Namur, where great concrete and steel fortresses were destroyed by shell fire of the guns of concealed position, and here is a letter written by Gen. H. L. Scott, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in which he describes the position of our Army in that respect to-day:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. DICK: I am very sorry not to have seen you when you were here. To-day is the first time I have been out since then. I took up the subject of the mobile guns of large caliber a year ago and have been agitating it ever since, with the result that we have got the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary on our side, and we have estimates in for six, to begin with. After we once get the carriage design approved we can get more. I believe they are very necessary on both coasts and intend to do all I can to get mobile guns of large caliber with carriage on trucks and railway carriages.

Regretting I have not had the opportunity of seeing you, I am,

Ever sincerely, yours,

H. L. SCOTT.

MR. EVANS R. DICK,
30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Dick had been discussing with me the question of movable guns of position, and this letter was so descriptive of the general condition of our defenselessness that he sent it to me in connection with our previous conversation.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for Gen. Scott; he is a brave old soldier, and I am glad that he is making this fight for these six guns; but what a pitiful picture this letter presents! We have no coast defenses, Mr. President. We have some harbor defenses—and great movable guns are needed for the defense of our country generally. There ought to be 600 such guns; and yet we have not a carriage designed and in condition to be approved, and after we get a carriage approved the General thinks he can get some more. Why, Mr. President, with this nakedness of ours from a military standpoint clearly apparent, what is this strange hypnotic control that some influences are exercising over the preparedness of this country? They are the very same influences, I believe, that when we come here striving for uniformity in the citizen soldiery of the United States oppose provision for the National Guardsmen, who can be furnished so much more cheaply than the volunteers and in so much greater numbers for the protection of the country. The whole thing has elements of mystery. The average Regular soldier costs \$1,150 a year; the average citizen soldier in the National Guard, as I have shown, costs \$170 a year. With all the pay and equipment that this bill proposes to give them, with all the increased power of discipline it proposes to give over them, five or six national guardsmen can be provided for the same cost of one soldier in the Regular Army, and in the first year two guardsmen can be furnished for the cost of one volunteer.

Mr. President, it has been testified by all the military experts that the defense of this country is no small thing; that anything less than a possible force of one or two million men is comparative defenselessness. Where are you going to get one or two million men for genuine defense? The only possible way is by the more economical method of disciplining the citizen soldier, the man who supports himself at home, the man who is not segregated from the productive activities of the Nation.

I desire now to discuss for a little while the constitutional objections which have been submitted here, especially by the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It is obvious that that Senator has strong feelings against the National Guard. I do not believe, however, that his feelings would affect his conclusions as a lawyer. They certainly do affect his figures when he speaks about the National Guard. I was struck the other day while he was talking that every time he mentioned the expenditure for the National Guard under this proposed legislation he added \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 to the round numbers, with a certain soaring of arithmetical enthusiasm that showed a feeling of condemnation on the inside.

MR. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With great pleasure.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator if it is not true, notwithstanding I soared occasionally on the question of figures, that I always kept below the estimates which are given by the House committee for the expense of the National Guard under its plan, and below the estimates given by the Senate committee for the expense of the National Guard under its plan?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I was so far away from the distinguished Senator that I could only see that he was soaring. I really do not recall the exact figures he used. I could see that he had not made any deduction whatever for the corrections that I had worked out and applied to the estimates of the committee. I could see that he had not taken in that mere little bagatelle of an error which the committee brought in here of \$19,000,000 for the first year's cost of the National Guard.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With great pleasure.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator believe the committee made an error of \$19,000,000?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is my impression. I am not yielding the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to answer that, but I do not care to occupy the floor against the Senator's wishes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator deal with it while I am on my feet; but the Vice President has taken the position that I would lose the floor—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Wyoming to ask if it were not true that a certain report showed certain figures different from what the Senator had been asserting.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator puts a different construction upon the figures, and I was going to correct it, if he would allow me to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is at liberty to yield at his pleasure the first time. He does not forfeit the floor until he has yielded the second time. The Senator is at liberty to yield to the Senator from Wyoming or anybody else the first time, for any sort of discussion he sees proper to engage in.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I should be glad to have the Senator suggest the correction while I am on my feet.

Mr. WARREN. The \$19,000,000 that the Senator speaks of to be deducted, was the cost of the equipment that is with the National Guard. Under section 56, providing for the enlistment of volunteers, there is an amount charged up there for the same kind of equipment, or a similar equipment, that amounts to nearly the whole sum.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That has got to be spent for the first year.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; of course it is money spent; but to go further, and say that the average per man is more, is not correct.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I simply take the position, Mr. President, that when the committee comes in with an estimate for the National Guard of the first-year cost, and includes in it the expenditures that have been made through 10 years past, it is not a proper first-year estimate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question, in order that I may be right?—because I do not desire to misrepresent.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. What does the Senator estimate to be the cost of the National Guard per annum after the third year?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have made no examination after the first year. I simply dealt with the first year, and I was kept pretty busy keeping up with the apparent errors of the committee for the first year. I have not had time to go into the estimates of the committee for the second and third and fourth years; but when, by correspondence with and visits to the department, I found a variation of \$19,000,000, it became necessary to attend to some other business, and I really did not have the time to inquire how much of this old material has been charged over and over again in these columns, if any. I presume, however, that the cost was carried along; because if you can put into a first-year estimate for the year 1917 expenditures made for material for 5 or 10 years back, then there is no reason why you should not put in with equal equity for the year 1918 the expenditures for 1917 and sundry years behind that.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] attacked the militia on the theory that they had usurped the powers of courts. I could

not help thinking, as he spoke, how much easier it would be for local courts and local sentiment in a State to correct any military usurpation by local soldiery than it would be to correct a national soldiery guilty of the same form of usurpation; and undoubtedly military power always will be guilty of usurpation in dealing with the affairs of citizens under martial or semi-martial conditions.

On one day the Senator from Idaho argued that the power of appointment by the States of local officers would give large local influence over the militia; and he quoted from Mr. Hamilton, the Federalist, No. 29, to the effect that the power of appointing officers would always secure a local influence in connection with the militia forces of the State.

Mr. President, I think that is a most excellent effect. I think that in a republic there should be some local sympathy, some local knowledge, some local connection in the mind and the political conscience of the officer. I think that is perhaps the fundamental reason why Gen. Washington and the framers of the Constitution provided, in this remarkable part of section 8, for that excellent balance in dealing with the militia between the States and the Nation as represented by Congress.

There are in that section only two powers reserved to the States—the appointment of the officers and the authority of training. Those two powers are reserved to the States, but that reservation is subject to an absolute control, because the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia has to be “according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.”

Mr. HARDWICK. Not the appointment of the officers.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly, both; and why separate them? How could the constitutional mind of Washington, the practical mind of Washington, consider the training of troops separately from the selection of the officers? They go together.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he will put in the RECORD, in connection with his remarks, the language of the Constitution on which he bases that remarkable contention.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will with great pleasure. I have just quoted it—

Reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

There is not an intimation that the discipline does not apply to the selection of the officer, as well as to the training that the officer is to give. Remarkable? Why, it is the inevitable meaning of plain language.

Let us turn to the dictionary.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, there is a comma after the words “appointment of the officers,” is there not? Is it not a complete sentence?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No; there is no comma after the word “officers” in the copy I have.

Mr. HARDWICK. There is in the Constitution.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not think, Mr. President, that the comma would deprive Congress of its jurisdiction, even if it should be found to be there. I am inclined to think that this serious question of providing a discipline for the militia, and for the qualifications of the officers who apply that discipline, is something that the Constitution intended Congress to have the power to control.

The word “prescribe,” Mr. President, is no mild word. It means “to set or lay down authoritatively for direction or control; to give as a law or direction; to lay down laws or rules; to give directions”; and one of the synonyms is “dictate.”

The word “discipline” is a strong word, Mr. President. It means “systematic training or subjection to authority; especially, the training of the mental, moral, and physical powers by instruction and exercise, and by authoritative control and direction; a course of exercise and practice in order to bring and keep under control, and to qualify for harmonious and effective action; the state of being subject to rule, or under control or command; systematic obedience; subjection; as, ‘his men are under perfect discipline’; a system of rules or method of practice.”

With these extensive powers reserved to the Congress of the United States, it is a singular thing that throughout more than 100 years of our history these powers have practically lain dormant; and only in the last 10 or 12 years, stung, perhaps, by the pitiable and miserable losses of the Spanish War, the horrible sicknesses that came from a lack of preparation, has there been some slight effort by Congress to exercise its extensive powers over the citizen soldiery of this country.

This is, indeed, a remarkable provision. It carries with it a perfect balance between the State and the Nation. It parallels the balance in all the rest of the Constitution; and it is

by reason of this provision, which, I believe, expresses the best thought of the best period of our Nation's life that I would prefer to see a harmonious militia, well disciplined, well armed, well organized, provided for and carried on by the Federal power granted to Congress under this section, and why I would prefer that that remnant of local sympathy which section 8 of article 1 would leave in the local soldiery should be left there for the protection of this great country from internal revolution.

Mr. President, in arming a great Nation we must arm it to repel attacks from within as well as attacks from without. We are arming to-day because we are convinced, as the chairman of the committee has wisely said, that man is a predatory animal, and that characteristic applies to men within national boundaries just as well as it does to men outside of national boundaries; and it especially applies to us, who are composed of all the nations that make up the peoples of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate and the attention of the gentlemen who stick in the bark on the power of Congress to organize, arm, and discipline the militia, to how natural and consistent it is to organizing and disciplining the militia that the words "according to the discipline prescribed by Congress," the last words in this particular clause of section 8, article 1, apply back to both the appointment of officers and the authority of training, because the appointment of the officer and the training that the officer gives are essentially the same function. The selection of the agent and the action of the agent are naturally contemplated in one mental process. To say that Congress can control, by prescribing a discipline, the action of the agents—the training—but is cut off, by a comma, from applying a discipline to appointing the agents—the officers—is to argue for an unreasonable incongruity. I mean, of course, the providing, as to officers, for certain general characteristics which a discipline, a rule of conduct, a law laid down, could provide—that these officers, from whom the authority of the State could make the appointment, must have qualified in some general way showing their ability to be officers.

Now, Mr. President, very briefly, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the corresponding language of the Swiss constitution in Article 21. It will be found in full on page 9 of Senate Document 360:

The composition of these bodies of troops, the maintenance of their effective strength, the appointment and promotion of their officers, shall belong to the Cantons, subject to general regulations which shall be issued to them by the Confederation.

In Switzerland, under the general military law of 1907, which I have included in Senate Document No. 360, that works out in this way: The great body of the troops of Switzerland are Cantonal troops. There are 22 Cantons in Switzerland. The country is divided as to races also. Two-thirds of the Swiss are German and the remaining third are French and Italian. All of their public documents are printed in the three languages. They have had to combine the 22 separate States or Cantons and three separate races into one effective Confederation for military purposes, and they have accomplished that combination and have presented to the world the spectacle of a perfect army composed of a citizen soldiery.

Why, Mr. President, for some years I used to be troubled by this continual slurring of the militia of this country, and I had gotten into my nature a little of the distrust of the ultimate possibilities that could be brought about by a citizen soldiery as a line of defense for our country. I had heard so much of this that I have made a study of Switzerland's military law and of her constitution as bearing on this question, and of the result of that law as expressed by the army that defends that country to-day. I have had considerable difficulty in getting some of this testimony. From about page 45 to page 70 of that document, the testimony bearing upon the efficiency of the Swiss Army is entirely new. It embraces the report of our present military attaché for Switzerland, Capt. Exton, of the United States Army.

The authorities of the War College refused to let me have that report, basing the refusal upon the order of the Secretary of War, Mr. Garrison. I did not argue the question with the general who refused to permit the copying of this document because I have respect for him. I believed him to be a good officer and that he properly construed his orders from Secretary of War Garrison as he understood them. But in view of the fact that Switzerland was a neutral country, in view of the fact that all the spies of all the world are there or could be there, it seemed to me perfectly obvious that there was no impropriety in publishing Capt. Exton's report.

But, as I say, I did not argue the question with our military authorities, but applied, through the State Department, to the Swiss military authorities for their permission to publish this

report, and in that connection received from them a brief statement showing the number of men mobilized in Switzerland and the time of that mobilization, and afterward secured an order from the present Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, for this evidence.

I wish to read into the RECORD what Capt. Exton, of the Artillery—now stationed in Switzerland, at Berne—says about the Swiss soldier:

The soldier: The appearance and work of the soldier during the few days of mobilization showed him to have so benefited by his previous training in service as to make the Swiss Army probably the best-trained army, for its size, in the world to-day.

Every man seemed thoroughly familiar with his duty, which he performed more or less as a matter of business.

The discipline appeared excellent and of the character that is cheerfully accepted rather than maintained by force. The relation between officers and men was quite intimate at times, yet there was at the same time such an observance of details as might be found only in the German Army.

As a matter of fact, everything about the Swiss Army, especially their thoroughness as to details, seems modeled after the German Army.

The officers: An officer of the line should never be judged, except after some considerable service either in campaign or at maneuvers—yet from the work observed during mobilization and from conversations with Swiss officers during the past three months it is believed that the Swiss officers will, especially since their service during the past year, compare favorably with the officers of any army in the world.

It must be remembered that the Swiss officers are selected from the educated men of Switzerland, and among them are found the leading men of every profession and business; and when one considers that in order to have reached the grade of second lieutenant he must have spent at least 336 days at intensive military training, 144 days of which is principally school work, one realizes the seriousness with which the service is accepted and the standard of thoroughness which may be attained in such a militia system.

Mr. PRESIDENT, I want to emphasize the fact that this is a militia system—this best-disciplined army of its size to-day in Europe.

If any Member of the Senate has any doubt as to what could be accomplished by the National Guard of the United States by Congress prescribing a discipline and by organizing an army and disciplining the militia, let him read this pamphlet and see what the Swiss have done for their army.

It is said, in extenuation of the failure of Congress to act, that Switzerland is a small country and that the mobilization which has been so effective, and which is made there every summer is relatively easy. Why, Mr. President, we can mobilize 200,000 men in sections every summer and mobilize our entire Guard and Federal Army every summer in as small a section as Switzerland covers if necessary. Compared with the resources of Switzerland, our resources are unlimited.

In this connection, and in conclusion, I want to read into the RECORD the language of Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, from *McCulloch* against Maryland, page 420, in which that great Chief Justice lays down the limitations of the implied powers of Congress. Why, Mr. President, if there were nothing in this section 8 except the words "organizing, arming, and disciplining," the implied powers would give Congress the necessary control of the details of that organization, arming, and disciplining; and the exceptions to the States from that large authority given Congress over the militia—the appointment of the officers and the authority to train—expressly limited and, as just now shown, are subject to the discipline prescribed by Congress. I maintain that under the powers of Congress this body has the right to see to it that the officer has the character and capacity, and that the officer with the capacity is the one appointed by the local authorities, and that the officer when appointed shall train the militia according to the discipline. The whole express power would be useless without the implied power to cause a discharge of an officer and to see to it by inspection that the officer acts according to the discipline.

With that suggestion I include the following language from *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. U. S. Sup. Ct., 420):

We admit, as all must admit, that the powers of the Government are limited, and that its limits are not to be transcended. But we think the sound construction of the Constitution must allow to the National Legislature that discretion, with respect to the means by which the powers it confers are to be carried into execution, which will enable that body to perform the high duties assigned to it in the manner most beneficial to the people. Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| Ashurst | Catron | Clapp | Culberson |
| Brandeggee | Chamberlain | Clark, Wyo. | Cummins |
| Burleigh | Chilton | Clarke, Ark. | Curtis |

du Pont
Gallinger
Harding
Hardwick
Hitchcock
Hughes
Husting
Johnson, Me.
Johnson, S. D.
Jones
Kenyon

Lane
Lee, Md.
Lewis
Lippitt
Lodge
McCumber
Martin, Va.
Nelson
Norris
O'Connor
Oliver

Overman
Page
Phelan
Pittman
Poindexter
Pomeroy
Robinson
Saulsbury
Shafroth
Sheppard
Smith, Md.

Smith, S. C.
Smoot
Swanson
Thomas
Vardaman
Warren
Weeks
Williams

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the adoption of the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] for section 56.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, just a word in explanation of the difference between section 56 and the substitute offered.

Section 56 is weak in that it does not start with any organized unit and there is no incentive to induce men to go somewhere to meet some one else from somewhere whom they have never met for the sole purpose of being drilled for four weeks.

The substitute lays hold of an organization of a military character already created, and everywhere throughout the country, whose very existence springs from the military instinct—an organization which would earnestly welcome this opportunity for greater perfection of drill and greater knowledge of military tactics.

Section 56 depends for its success upon the individual impulse of the citizen without support and without that animation which organized numbers alone can evoke.

The substitute utilizes the enthusiasm of youth which has already found expression in organization and directs it into the realm of accomplishment and national usefulness.

Section 56, in my judgment, will not bear the fruitage expected by its authors. A 30-day enlistment and drill each year at your own expense, which binds you to give your services at a time you may believe they are not needed, or they can with less hardship be performed by others whose situation is more favorable, is not a very great inducement to enroll under this section. The difficulty in securing an enlistment of 20,000 men, recently authorized, might well open our eyes to the reality of this condition.

The substitute, because it is giving just the opportunity which these students wish, will, in my judgment, result in more offers than the Government could accept.

Section 56, if it could be made a success at all, would give an army of about 260,000 at the utmost.

The substitute would give an army of at least 750,000 to begin with, and as each student would be subject to call in case of war up to the age of 45 years, would in a very few years give us an auxiliary army of millions.

Section 56 provides for a training of 30 days annually, certainly a very meager training for a soldier.

The substitute would require training one day each week for 9 or 10 months, as is the present rule, and this in addition to the camp life and camp training of at least two months on the larger scale.

Section 56 contemplates the training of those who are outside or beyond the student age. It would draw men from their business and occupations.

The substitute operates during the student life in association with it, supplementing the mental with physical exercises, assisting in developing both the mental and physical, and without any loss or waste of time.

Section 56, as already suggested in this debate, would give us at least a quasi aristocratic organization of gentlemen—a sort of exclusive military club.

This substitute draws the youth from every rank of life, develops and intensifies the sentiment of brotherhood and equality, and sends them back into the avenues of civil life, thereby preventing the military spirit from becoming the dominant or controlling sentiment of those who are thus prepared for war.

Mr. President, I noticed in introducing the amendment I inadvertently omitted three words, and I will ask to correct the amendment before it is voted on. On page 2, line 7, after the words "high school," I wish to insert "academy and college."

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I raise a question of order as to whether the motion of the Senator from North Dakota, which is a motion to strike out and insert, takes precedence over the motion of the Senator from Maryland, which is a motion simply to strike out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rule provides that one shall not prejudice the other. It is not a motion in the third degree. The Chair looks at the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to insert the matter proposed by him in lieu of section 56 as the pending question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does that take precedence of simply a motion to strike out?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in the nature of a perfecting motion. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Maryland to strike out section 56.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to record my protest against the tone of much of the argument that has been made in favor of section 56. There is running through substantially all that has been said in behalf of this section the thought, if not the expression, that those of us who believe that it ought to be expunged from the bill are not patriotic; that we are opposed to adequate military preparedness. I do not suggest that those who are for the section are less patriotic than I am; I do not suggest that they are less sincere or earnest in their desire to prepare this country against any danger that may beset her than I am; and I appeal, as a matter of fairness, against the intolerance which betrays itself in the suggestion that those of us who believe that the National Guard as an organized reserve in the country is better than the combination of the volunteer reserve and the guard reserve are wanting in our duty at the present moment.

I am just as sincerely in favor of preparedness—adequate, reasonable, efficient preparedness—as is the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator in this body. I am opposed to the section and to the force it proposes because I feel—it seems to me that I know—that in the operation of the section or the organization of the volunteer reserve army and the National Guard both will become inefficient; that the one will not be created and the other will be disintegrated.

As I said once before in discussing this section, it is impossible to believe that when peace comes—and I assume we do not intend to be constantly in war—the Congress of the United States will not appropriate \$100,000,000 each year for the purpose of maintaining an organized reserve. The whole history of the country leads to no other conclusion than the one I have just stated, and we are face to face with these alternatives, in my opinion. We must either take the Guard, strengthen it as we can or as we see fit, or we must take the volunteer army and create it, with such equipment and such organization as it ought to have. It is unwise and impolitic to do both, for in the struggle that will constantly be maintained between them we will treat both meagerly, inadequately, and neither will ever constitute the reserve toward which we are looking.

I have no prejudice against the volunteer army. If Congress desires to depend upon it rather than upon the National Guard, I will not protest, and I will be willing to give it all the aid that it needs in order to become a strong, dependable force. I believe that the guard is the better force. It is already organized. It already has the confidence of the young men upon whom we must depend in the various States. We can maintain it, we can perpetuate it, with vastly less expenditure of money than will be required if we endeavor to raise a volunteer army to a similar strength and a similar state of efficiency. We are here about to authorize a regular army of 180,000 men, with the authority on the part of the President in time of war to raise it to 250,000 men. I do not assert—

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CUMMINS. In just a moment. I do not assert that the army proposed is too large. I do not believe it is too large, although I will have a comment to make in a moment with regard to the system we are employing with respect to the Regular Army. I yield now to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I would like to ask the Senator just one question. Is there any reason why discipline and maneuvering, such as that furnished at Plattsburg, could not be furnished to the National Guard somewhere?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is furnished in the National Guard. There was no facility for training presented at Plattsburg that is not presented in every field meeting of a well-organized guard, and I know—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, because I have seen the guard in operation, and I know something of its fidelity to the instructions that are imposed upon it by officers of the Regular Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely want to suggest to the Senator that the question of summer camps is not directly nor necessarily associated with this volunteer army at all, and section 52 of the House bill provides adequately for summer camps, although the volunteer or continental army was discarded by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CUMMINS. I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia. I will now yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I simply wanted to ask the Senator why he thought there would be any deadly competition between this volunteer force and the National Guard. It seems to me that it would be emulation rather than competition, and that providing for the one furnishes no reason in the world for not providing for the other. If the National Guard needs anything at all it needs a healthy emulation. The Senator has just said that the National Guard might have maneuvers, but they meet only five days in the year, and the Senator must assuredly be apprised of the fact that they can hardly master skirmish drill during those five days, even if they served three years, which would make 15 days. Assuredly the Senator must know that there is nothing that could take place in connection with the force provided for under section 56 which would either cripple or kill or vigorously compete against the National Guard. He must know that the men who will attend the so-called Plattsburg drills under section 56 are men who, under no circumstances, would enlist in the National Guard. Now, why not leave us both instead of merely one?

Mr. CUMMINS. Simply because I—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Iowa that the interruption of the Senator from Mississippi was not a question; it was a speech. If the Senator yields again he loses his right to the floor under the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg pardon. I did not hear what the Chair said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair said the interruption of the Senator from Mississippi was not a question; it was debate in the most positive terms.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With all due deference to the Chair, it was a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair differs with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was nothing in it except a question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will be guided by the judgment of the Chair in that respect, and I will endeavor to conclude what I have to say without incurring the hazard of losing the floor.

My reply to the Senator from Mississippi, because, however elaborate the statement, it was really a question, is this. Congress will not maintain both. I do not mean to say that Congress would not authorize such a camp as we had at Plattsburg or at Fort Sheridan. The mere provision for such a camp is not the scope of this section. It is true that these exhibitions of military enthusiasm furnish illustrations to those speaking for section 56 of its need or necessity, but section 56 has no relation at all to temporary camps of the character to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred. In section 56 we are giving the President the power, without any real restriction, to raise an Army of 261,000 men, to arm them, to equip them, to command them. They are brought into the service for the purpose of training. They are required to enlist in the Army of the United States, and if that enlistment be in the same terms as now required of enlisted men in the Regular Army they will be required to obligate themselves to serve for seven years in the Army for such length of time as the President may think best in training only, but with the power on the part of the President to order them at any moment, when war or threatened war seems before us, into the actual service for the purpose of fighting the battles of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield now, Mr. President, for a question, and a question only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For a question only.

Mr. CUMMINS. And I rely upon the Chair to protect me in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator must be the judge of his own rights.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A question that will elicit information and not convey argument or antagonize or support the argument.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi will see that I must yield only for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very sorry that question should have been raised. I asked the Senator to yield to me for a question. I did not ask anything more.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not make any difference for what purpose the Senator yields; if he is going to permit the Senator from Mississippi to make a speech, his time is exhausted. The Senator from Mississippi can make a speech if he wants.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Considering the fact that the Chair and the Senator from Iowa both seem to be suspicious of my motive, I will not even ask the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I beg to assure the Senator from Mississippi that I am not suspicious of his motive. I was compelled under the circumstances in order to retain the floor to say that I yielded for a question, and I shall regret it very much if—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I will ask the question.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question is this. Will the Senator tell me why there should be a question of competition rather than merely a question of emulation between the National Guard and this volunteer force?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will endeavor to make—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that that is nothing but an argument, and the Senator must take the chance of the Senator who interrogates him as to whether or not he will confine himself to the rule. In the judgment of the Chair the Senator from Iowa has forfeited the floor.

Mr. LEWIS. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to continue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For what length of time does the Senator desire to proceed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, against the ruling of the Chair just pronounced I respectfully take an appeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because even under the ruling of the Chair I have done nothing except to ask a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the appeal.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the appeal I ask that the Reporter read precisely what the Senator from Mississippi said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that is proper, and the Reporter will read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that my language be read to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that it be done in order to prove that it was nothing but a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done. The ruling is that the question must be such as to elicit information about a question of fact, not in the nature of an argument, it makes no difference whether it is long or short.

The Reporter read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I will ask the question.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question is this: Will the Senator tell me why there should be a question of competition rather than merely a question of emulation between the National Guard and this volunteer force?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon the ruling of the Chair I take an appeal to the Senate upon the ground that even upon the Chair's ruling a Senator has a right to ask another Senator a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If it is a question to elicit information, the Chair agrees with the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are called for.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the rule is to be of any value at all, it must be uniformly enforced and uniformly respected. The Chair has not any power to enlarge it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the question is taken I should like to know, for information, what we are to vote on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is whether or not a question which conveys or calls for argument is a question for information.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit it is not that; that it is whether the question submitted by the Senator from Mississippi is a question which is allowable under the rule that has been established by somebody, I do not know by whom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. ASHURST, who voted in the affirmative, and the names of Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. BECKHAM.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I should like to have the form of the proposition we are to vote upon stated by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know exactly what the question is. There is so much confusion in the Chamber that I have been unable to understand it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair made a ruling that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] had asked a question which conveyed an argument. The Senator from Mississippi appeals from the ruling of the Chair; and the question is, Shall the opinion of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll call has started.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order while the roll is being called. The roll call will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In the absence of that Senator I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. He being absent, and I not knowing how he would vote on this question if he were present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. As I understand it, the Senator from Missouri and I are going to exchange those pairs, so that I may transfer my pair to my colleague and the Senator from Missouri may transfer his pair to the Senator from Florida. I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], who is unavoidably absent, and I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I should like to inquire if the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a pair with that Senator, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the negative). I have voted notwithstanding my pair, but I am very much in doubt whether or not I should do so. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. DU PONT (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. DU PONT. I have a general pair with that Senator, and not knowing how he would vote if present I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]; and

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. BURLEIGH. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. In his absence I withhold my vote, and will let this announcement stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—24.

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| Ashurst | Hardwick | Shafroth | Taggart |
| Bankhead | Lewis | Sheppard | Thomas |
| Chamberlain | Martin, Va. | Sherman | Thompson |
| Clarke, Ark. | Phelan | Smith, Ga. | Underwood |
| Culberson | Ransdell | Smith, S. C. | Vardaman |
| Gore | Robinson | Swanson | Walsh |

NAYS—33.

| | | | |
|------------|----------|-------------|------------|
| Brandegee | Husting | Norris | Sterling |
| Broussard | Jones | Oliver | Sutherland |
| Catron | Kenyon | Overman | Townsend |
| Clapp | Lane | Page | Warren |
| Cummins | Lee, Md. | Pittman | Williams |
| Curtis | Lippitt | Polindexter | Works |
| Dillingham | Lodge | Pomerene | |
| Gallinger | McCumber | Reed | |
| Harding | Nelson | Smoot | |

NOT VOTING—39.

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Beckham | Fletcher | La Follette | Shields |
| Borah | Goff | Lea, Tenn. | Simmons |
| Brady | Gronna | McLean | Smith, Ariz. |
| Bryan | Hitchcock | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Md. |
| Burleigh | Hollis | Myers | Smith, Mich. |
| Chilton | Hughes | Newlands | Stone |
| Clark, Wyo. | James | O'Gorman | Tillman |
| Colt | Johnson, Me. | Owen | Wadsworth |
| du Pont | Johnson, S. Dak. | Penrose | Weeks |
| Fall | Kern | Saulsbury | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the appeal of the Senator from Mississippi, the yeas are 24 and the nays are 33. So the decision of the Chair does not stand as the judgment of the Senate. The Chair construes the action of the Senate without any possible personal feeling in the matter. The only desire of the Chair was to enforce what he understood to be the rule. Now that the Senate has deliberately established another rule, the Chair will just as loyally enforce that one, if he can. So we go back to the old practice of allowing the Senator on the floor to be the judge as to whether or not he shall be interrupted, by whom, and for what purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is not any longer necessary.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have, however, the privilege of limiting the purpose for which I shall yield, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize that the Senator from Iowa can not yield for anything except a question under the rules. I do not ask him to yield at all; but, after the Senator is through, I intend to make a few comments upon the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may do as he is advised.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I make no comment upon the ruling of the Chair, for there has been so much uncertainty with reference to this particular matter that it is not strange that there is difference of opinion about it; but I will proceed at once to answer the question propounded to me by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Senator from Mississippi asks why it is that there need be any conflict between the National Guard and the Volunteer Army to be organized under section 56? There is no conflict in the sense in which the Senator from Mississippi uses the word; there is no feeling between them, or I hope there would be no feeling between the men who would volunteer under section 56 and the men who volunteer in the National Guard. It is not because I think there would be any rancor or any contest between these two bodies of men that I oppose section 56. I oppose it because, as I have said many times, it simply strikes down our entire efficient organized force; and I marvel that anybody who favors preparedness in any degree can see his way clear to the creation of the volunteer force.

Why, Mr. President, we have authorized here a Regular Army of 180,000 men. The Regular Army is our principal defense; and now we propose not to have reserves, as they are ordinarily understood, but to create organized reserves in companies, regiments, brigades, divisions, corps, to the extent of more than 500,000 men, assuming that the National Guard is enlisted to its full strength and that the Volunteer Army is enlisted to its full strength.

Mr. President, do you believe that the people of the United States in times of peace will sustain, at an annual expense of \$100,000,000 or more, two organized bodies of reserves, with their companies, regiments, and divisions, all ready to move into the field actively, together with a Regular Army of 180,000 men? No. The disproportion is absurd; it is sustained by no experience in the world.

Mark you, I am not now speaking of the vast number of unorganized trained young men who will be called upon to volunteer in the event of war; I am speaking of three great armies: One constantly in the service, called the Regular Army; one intermittently in the service, called the Volunteer Army; and the third, intermittently in the service, called the National Guard. We ought not to delude ourselves with any such pretense as necessarily grows out of the situation I have just described.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question, not under the rule, but because I do not want to be interrupted for anything but a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that there is any rule on the subject; but the Senator may limit his concession to his colleague to suit himself.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it not a fact that every nation in the world which has a reserve has a reserve which is three or four times as large as its standing army?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, that brings me to a very interesting point in this discussion. I had intended to deal with it at a later time, but, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska, I might just as well express my opinion upon it now.

The whole plan of preparation represented in the bill now before us is utterly inadequate. No nation in all time was ever prepared for war under the volunteer system. I want that to sink into the consciousness of the Senator from Nebraska. A nation can not prepare itself for war under a volunteer system. Volunteers will fight a war—and our main reliance, if we are ever so unfortunate as to be engaged in war with a great nation, will be upon volunteers—but we can not prepare so that we are instantly ready to carry on a conflict of that kind through the volunteer system.

The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon have challenged those of us who favor the elimination of section 56 to a "show-down." I am here to accept that challenge; I am here to say that if we ever are prepared for war, if we change the policy which has been maintained throughout the whole life of the Republic and reach the conclusion that we ought to be really prepared at an instant's notice for a great conflict, then we must abandon this theory, this traditional volunteer regular army.

Why should the Senator from Nebraska or why should the Senator from Iowa expect one of his fellow men to fight for him at \$15 a month and board? It is absurd. If we ask the citizens of the United States to organize themselves in sufficient numbers to constitute a regular army which will be adequate against any attack that may be precipitated against us, then we must have compulsory service. Why should the Regular Army not be made up of all our citizens? I do not mean at the same time, and I am not now speaking of the number which should constitute the Regular Army; but assuming, as this bill has assumed, that we need a Regular Army of 250,000 men, and in time of peace of 180,000, why do you ask men to enroll themselves in it at \$15 a month and board? Why should not the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Iowa, if we are not both over age, take our chances and bear the burdens of citizenship in a country like this? Why should we not constitute a part of the Regular Army, if in the chances of conscription the lot should fall upon us?

I venture to say that the Regular Army provided for in this bill—and I was really glad to hear the Senator from Oregon yesterday grant its inadequacies in this respect—I venture to say that the Regular Army provided for in the bill will never be enlisted to the extent of 180,000 men, unless we engage in war. When war comes, when the peril is upon us, then there is a patriotism that springs to the country's need, and supplies the lack of attractiveness that we now see in the enlisted ranks. Who will work for \$15 a month under command of officers who feel, and necessarily feel, all the authority vested in them?

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] himself read only a day or two ago—and he was supplemented by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] a little later—that, notwithstanding all the efforts that the Government was able to put forth to enlist men under the authority recently granted to the President, we had not yet, according to the Senator from Oregon, enlisted 2,500 men, and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that we are in some peril on account of the situation in Mexico, a peril that might well stimulate and energize the patriotism of all the people of this country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will not the Senator now answer my question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have in substance answered the Senator's question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I asked the Senator from Iowa to name a single country in the world that maintains a regular army that does not maintain a reserve several times as large as the army, and the Senator has not answered the question.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no other country in the world that has any such system as is here proposed unless some parallel could be drawn between this plan and that followed by Great Britain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me ask the Senator another question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will not enter into an argument with the Senator from Nebraska, for I am answering his question. The suggestion I have just made answers the question of the Senator from Nebraska. Every country that declares as its policy complete preparedness for war has every citizen of military age in its reserve. It is not a question of willingness or unwillingness to serve as a supplementary body; it is a part of the policy of the military nations to lay these burdens upon all their boys and all their men until they pass the military age, and they are all parts of one great army which we in this country would call the Regular Army. I want, therefore, the Senators who are so enthusiastic for preparedness to come, if they desire, and meet that real issue. If it is to be insisted that this Nation shall always be ready to engage any other nation in the world upon a moment's notice in war, then the volunteer system proposed by this bill is a shadow hardly a beginning in the process of reforming or changing or transforming the policy which has for more than 100 years been observed among the American people.

I want to put an end now, for all time, if I can, to this constant reproach in all the big newspapers of the land that anyone who has the temerity to question the wisdom of anything that is proposed in this bill is an enemy of his country and opposed to proper preparedness. I resent that charge. I understand perfectly that no Senator who has discussed the bill has directly questioned the motives of any Senator who intends to vote for the elimination of section 56; but I repeat that in every utterance there is against those who favor its elimination an offensive tone. We who believe that the National Guard should constitute the organized reserve of the country, and believe that any attempt to divide the contribution or the support given by the General Government to the organized reserves will but weaken them both and render both incapable of performing the services expected of them, are just as devoted to the Union, just as attached to its honor, and just as determined to defend its integrity as those who believe—honestly believe, I have no doubt—that we ought to create these two bodies of organized reserves.

I do not represent the National Guard any more than I represent the Regular Army or the volunteer army that might be organized under this bill. I have just as much devotion to the one as to the other. No man can exceed me in his admiration for the courage and the efficiency of the officers of the Regular Army of the United States, and no man surpass me in his appreciation of the devotion and the steadiness of the enlisted men.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator contend that there is no country which maintains a reserve several times larger than its standing army, except in the case of involuntary service?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know of any.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I will tell the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator will speak in his own time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator about Great Britain, then?

Mr. CUMMINS. I made an exception of Great Britain. The Senator heard me make the exception.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator about Spain and Sweden, then?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not examined the military laws of Spain and Sweden, but I can not allow the Senator to inject the legislation of those countries in my remarks. I would not care if Sweden and Spain do maintain such a reserve; it would not affect my judgment of American human nature or my opinion with respect to the best course that the Congress of the United States ought to pursue. When I come to examine those laws, I have no doubt that I will find that they agree in substance with the statement I have made.

Mr. President, it is not for me to defend the National Guard against some of the insinuations and aspersions which have been cast upon the members of that military body—I mean the aspersions growing out of their interest in the legislation and out of the telegrams which they have sent to certain Members of this body. I would be the last man to excuse the tone of the letter read this morning at the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I agree that it was offensive;

but are we to condemn 120,000 of the best boys in the country—not better, of course, than their brothers in the same community, but boys with whom I, at least, am proud to associate; boys who understand their duty to their country, and are proud to perform it—are we to impeach them and overthrow their reputation because an ill-considered letter was written by one officer of the Guard to a Member of this body?

The injustice of holding, or trying to hold, or suggesting that we hold, all the members of the Guard responsible for an intemperate, injudicious act committed by one of them must be so apparent that I need not further enlarge upon it.

I know that the members of the National Guard—while I do not speak for them; I have no authority to speak for them—are simply attempting to do what they believe best for their country. They have no other motive save the motive which actuates all of us to do the thing which will promote the strength and the dignity and the safety of the United States. If they are mistaken with regard to the effect which this section will have upon their organization, it is a mistake in which, without any influence whatsoever from them, I share, because I believe that these two bodies of organized reserves will not be maintained by the United States. It is uneconomical; it is unmilitary; it is indefensible from my point of view, and we ought not to enter upon that experiment. I repeat that if the Senate honestly believes that the Volunteer Army will constitute a better source, a more reliable and dependable source of strength if we fall into the misfortune of war, then we ought to bend all our energies to the creation of a body of reserves in that way. My contention is that we are defeating the very object we are trying to attain when we endeavor to create and maintain these two distinct bodies in our military force.

Mr. President, if I believed that the National Guard had any sinister design upon the liberties of our country; if I could see, in the efforts that have been made to promote their organization, any desire to infringe upon the rights of citizens; if I could see, in all that they do, anything but a deep, profound desire to render service to their country, and service of the exact kind this bill contemplates, I would not feel so earnestly about it. But being sure of their patriotism, and being sure of their persistent energy, and being sure, if we give to them whatever aid we can and federalize them so far as we can, that when the moment comes when we need military strength we can get in that way more of it and of a better quality than we could possibly get in the way proposed by the committee. I am doing what I can to maintain them as a permanent body, simply because I believe that if they are made to understand that their future depends upon the maintenance of these two independent bodies all spirit will be driven out of them, and we will have delivered a fatal blow to their growth and their efficiency.

Allow me to say to the Senator from Mississippi that if this section provided only for such experiments as were conducted over the country last year in the way of camps to which men who had no opportunity to ally themselves with the Guard could resort, I would have no objection whatever to it; but these camps are not the things provided for in this section. If we want to give the men who spend their vacations in this way an opportunity to do it under more favorable circumstances, I will join in any legislation which has that for its object. But that is not the object of the section. The purpose of the section is to enlist an army of 260,000 reserves—organized reserves. The object of the militia portions of the bill, or the Guard portions of the bill, is to enlist a body of reserves of the same number; and I am impelled to the conclusion that the effort to maintain them both will prove a disastrous failure.

Mr. HARDWICK and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi indicated that he desired to address the Chair. If the Senator from Georgia will excuse the Chair, he will recognize the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise merely for the purpose of explaining the recent appeal from the decision of the Chair, the grounds upon which it was based, and the result which alone can legitimately follow from it; and in that connection it becomes absolutely necessary to say something about the obiter dictum involved in the decision of the Chair.

After the Senate had ruled on my appeal the Chair announced that the Chair would go back to the old practice. Now, that was not the object of the appeal; that was not the result of the appeal; and that ought not to be the effect of the appeal. I am talking now in order to straighten out future rulings of the Chair.

I am just as much opposed as anybody is to a Senator upon the floor farming out the floor to other Senators under the guise of asking questions in order that other Senators may

make speeches; nor was that principle to the slightest degree involved in the appeal, except by the obiter dictum of the Chair, and it was purely obiter dictum at that. I am opposed to that because it is dilatory, because it is objectionable in every possible way, and because the past rulings of the Presidents and Presidents pro tempore of the Senate have pronounced it objectionable and dilatory.

Mr. President, the question between you and the Senate, or between you and me which was decided by the Senate, was this: Was my interjection into the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] a question or was it an argument? That is all. All that the Chair was called upon to decide was whether it was a question or an argument. The Chair decided that it was an argument. Now it becomes necessary to state just what occurred.

I rose and asked the Senator from Iowa if he would yield to a question. He yielded to a question. Even if after that I had put something to him that was not a question, the Senator from Iowa would not have been responsible for it and could not in justice have been held responsible for it. He could have interrupted me the moment I transcended the limits, and could have said to me, "That is not a question; it is an argument." Or the Chair could have interrupted me and could have said, "The Senator from Iowa has yielded for a question, and the Senator from Mississippi is making a speech or an argument," and then the Chair would have been exactly right. But I asked the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for a question, and the Senator from Iowa yielded to me for a question, and yielded for no other purpose; and in taking the appeal from the decision of the Chair I was not taking it to protect myself, I was taking it to protect the Senator from Iowa.

When the Senator yielded for a question, I propounded this question: "Why does the Senator from Iowa contend that these two clauses relating to the volunteer force and the National Guard constitute a competition rather than an emulation?"

Now, I may be stupid; I may be almost idiotic, and at times I think most of us are; but if I could frame a question at all, that would be an interrogation. I framed it in that way because, just a moment before that, the Chair had given me an intimation, upon a previous so-called question, that I must not argue; and if the Chair had made the ruling upon the previous question the Chair would have been right. But the Chair did not make it there. The Chair made it upon the last question, which was nothing in the world but a question.

Now, the Chair knows me and I know the Chair, and we both know that there could not be any question of personal antagonism that anybody in the world could raise between us two. I do think, however, that when the Chair went out of his way, after the Senate had decided the question against the Chair and in favor of my appeal, to say that hereafter we will go back to the old practice—and the old practice admitted of infinite farming out of the floor by one Senator to another—the Chair was pronouncing purely an obiter dictum which the Chair had no right to pronounce. The Chair had no right to say that the effect of the vote of the Senate upon that appeal was to say that hereafter any Senator may farm out the floor for any sort of an interruption, because what the Senate really did decide was this, and this only—that my interruption was an interrogative interruption, and not an argumentative interruption.

The Senate decided that I was right in that contention and that the Chair was wrong in that contention, and that is all that the Senate decided; and I decline to let the Chair make out of that appeal, and out of its successful maintenance by the Senate, the contention that hereafter any occupant of the Chair—he or anybody else—will be justified in ruling that one Senator has a right to interrupt another for the purpose of making a speech or an argument, rather than merely for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. President, it may be said that a man may ask a question for information or he may ask a question in order to puncture an argument; but provided it be a question and a mere interrogation, the ultimate motive of the question does not apply. I may ask some Senator, who is talking about the negro question, where he lives. That may involve an argument, because if he lives where there are no negroes he may give me one answer, and if he lives where there is a majority of them he may give me another. It might be said that the question involved an argument, but not in the question. It would involve, perhaps, an argument in the answer, but not in the question itself.

I rose, Mr. President, merely to say that the decision of the Senate meant only what the Senate decided, not what the Chair, by obiter dictum, put into it by remarks which were totally uncalled for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The last remark of the Senator from Mississippi would justify more being said than I intend to say.

Under the rule there is no more right to ask a question than to interrupt a Senator in any other form; but it has been worked into the rule as an implied exception growing out of the necessity for it. It occasionally happens that it is necessary to know more definitely a certain state of facts in order to apply intelligently the argument that is being made. Custom, therefore, has introduced a limitation on the rule that permits a Senator to yield for a question, and all the rulings that have been heretofore made on that subject have recognized that implied exception.

The Chair believed, in view of the growing business of the country and the length of the sessions of Congress, that the Senate was prepared to enforce, with more strict respect to its spirit and meaning, the rule which allowed a Senator to address the Senate but twice on the same day on the same question; and that these continued interruptions, notwithstanding they are not only had by the consent of the Senator having the floor but are frequently actually invited by the Senator speaking—it gives him a new topic to discuss, which is not at all times offensive—were to be discouraged in every proper way. If there were none to be considered except the Senator addressing the Senate and the Senator who desired to interrupt, there would be little complaint about the old practice; but it is evident to some of us now that it has the effect of extending the sessions, diverting the discussions, and almost invariably depleting the Senate Chamber. It therefore occurred to me that the rule might be enforced according to its real spirit and intent in really limiting each Senator to the right to address the Senate twice only on the same question and on the same day.

Under this condition, unless the Chair is somewhat largely the judge of the character of the question that implies an argument, or invites an argument, or punctures an argument, the rule has no value at all. Of course, he could arbitrarily apply it if disposed to do it; but I do not think I have made that reputation here. At least I have not done so wittingly. No self-respecting officer will make a ruling that is subject on every occasion to be censured according to the color and bias of the personal and political surroundings at the time.

I had no objection to the Senator from Mississippi appealing from the decision of the Chair. On the contrary, I invited it, because I wanted the judgment of the Senate to settle the limits of the rule, once and for all. This is the Senate. It makes its own rules. It supervises those who enforce them; and the way in which it wants them enforced is the way in which they should be enforced.

The matter has been disposed of. I shall not hereafter undertake to guess what is a question and what is not a question within the sense of the rule. I have tried to define it as an inquiry that would elicit information about a matter of fact. If it involves an answer to an argument, or if it suggests an argument, or if it punctures an argument, as the Senator from Mississippi says, I thought it was argumentative in character, and I therefore took that view of it. The Senate has decided in the particular case that the rule as the Chair understood was not to be enforced; and as there is no standard by which the Chair can determine in the future what a question is, he therefore shall decline to guess about it. The Senate must, on objection from the floor, hereafter be the judge of that matter itself.

The Chair invited the appeal. The Chair is entirely satisfied to have it settled. The Chair is not mad with anybody about the action taken. The Chair did not say anything that he supposed was uncalled for, otherwise he would not have said it; and he is sure the Senator from Mississippi will not care to adhere to that observation when he thinks about the matter a little further.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, there have been so many arguments made with reference to this question that are not justified by the facts, and there are so many misapprehensions both here and in the country about the real meaning of this section, that I feel that before we vote, those of us who favor the elimination of this section ought to call attention to certain inconsistencies in the arguments and positions of the proponents of this proposition.

In the first place, you would think from the telegrams individual Senators are receiving about this matter that the real thing involved in section 56 was these summer training camps like the one at Plattsburg, and people throughout this Republic are appealing to Senators not to do away with the summer training camps. Why, Mr. President, the proposition involved in section 56 is neither directly nor necessarily associated with these training camps in the remotest degree whatever.

In the Hay bill, for instance, where the continental-army plan was rejected—a proposition, by the way, which the House of Representatives defeated by an overwhelming majority—provision was made in section 82 for these summer training camps, and there is no reason on earth why we can not have camps like those at Plattsburg and Fort Oglethorpe throughout the country without necessarily having to have either a volunteer or a continental army. So much for that phase of the question.

One argument made was that the Senate ought to provide for this volunteer force, because business men who did not have time to attend the militia drills could go into this system, and would do so, and yet the argument was made by these same gentlemen, the proponents of this bill, that the militia were so inefficient, drilled so little, and were so poorly trained that we ought to have this more efficient volunteer force instead of the militia. They blow hot one minute and cold the other, and we can not confine them to either side of anything connected with this question. They insist on having both sides of the whole business.

If the volunteer force proposed by section 56 is going to provide a well-disciplined, thoroughly trained, efficient military reserve force for the United States, it is going to take time, and lots of time, from these business men; and the very business men to whom the proponents of this measure said this system appeals, who have not time to go into an "inefficient" militia, will never have time to embrace any of its benefits. On the other hand, Mr. President, if the fact is that this system is to establish a nice, gilded, summer-resort proposition for weary business men of affairs who like to hie themselves away to the mountains or to the seacoast when the heated periods come—if it is going to do that, and if it is going to give to those men, I say, a nice summer vacation, and they are going to divert themselves by a little patriotic training in these summer camps, and it is to be no more than that—then I ask these distinguished gentlemen how much more efficient will this volunteer force be than our militia?

It seems to me that they impale themselves on one or the other horn of this dilemma.

Mr. President, in the course of his very eloquent and very forceful remarks on yesterday, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], invoking as he did the patriotic spirit of this country to come to the assistance of his beleaguered bill and to save his threatened section, said one thing that was true absolutely beyond all question, and that is, I think, the keynote of this entire situation. He spoke not only with eloquence but with historical accuracy when he said, "The boys of this country have fought every war that it has ever had." That is the truth; and yet when I propose to establish these reserves, not in a summer man's frolicking camp, not even in the militia, as far as the real backbone of the reserves goes, but in the schools and colleges of this country, where 2,000,000 boys are who can and will gladly furnish all the reserve forces that this country need, I can get no support from this honorable committee. I say they are wedded to ideas, that they want to do something that pride of opinion has committed them to, or they would not neglect this school question.

Just one other observation, and I shall have concluded what I want to say on this section, because I do think we ought to come to as speedily a vote as is possible.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] yesterday appealed—almost on his knees, metaphorically—to Members of this body, and especially to Members on this side, to stand by the committee and follow the committee. Senators, I have had somewhat of a long service, for a man of my years, here in Congress, in one House or the other; and I fully agree with the Senator from Nebraska that ordinarily you ought to follow the recommendations of your committees, especially in the other House of Congress, where, I am willing to say, measuring my words, that committee work is much more efficient and painstaking than it is in this House of Congress. But it seems to me that that rule is subject to several qualifications that no fair-minded or experienced legislator can well dispute.

If it is a question of information—something that the committee has had the opportunity to study out, something that the committee has had the time and the opportunity and the means to know about better than other Members of the body who are not on the committee—then, of course, we ought to follow the committee, because they have superior information on the question at issue, and have had the opportunity and the time, and have taken both, to familiarize themselves with the question. But, on the other hand, Senators, if the question at issue is one of principle, if it is merely whether we are going to apply to a proposition one governmental principle or another,

then I think any Senator in this body is just as capable of forming his own opinion, expressing and voicing and voting his own conviction, as any member of any committee that this body ever appointed or constituted.

So much, Mr. President, for the issues involved in the motion to strike out section 56. We will never get a real reserve for this country unless we do one of two things. The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] mentioned one of them yesterday—compulsory military service—and I want to say to him and to a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who voiced the same sentiment to-day it is utterly repugnant to my democratic instincts, aye, to my American instincts, to hear such a sentiment expressed here and such a course suggested. I do not believe in compulsory military training. It is un-American, and I hope and pray the time may never come when we shall have to resort to it in this country.

The happy geographical isolation of the American Republic has long saved our people so far from the burdens of this character that European nations have had to bear. I do not believe the situation has so changed or that the time has yet come when we must depart from one of the best of American principles and say to our people they must bear the burden of general and compulsory military service. Even in England, Mr. President, the other great Anglo-Saxon country of this world, although that country is engaged in a colossal struggle in which her very life is at stake, the idea of general compulsory service among all her people is not generally popular. The instincts of our people are peaceable. They are democrats—and I use the word broadly, not in a partisan sense—in their tastes, peaceful in their instincts, and we do not want to set up any military establishment in this country like that which the taxpayers of Europe have groaned under for years. It is not necessary. There is nothing in the situation here or elsewhere that suggests any such necessity. If we are not going to do that, and I hope the time will never come when stern national necessity will require it, and I do not believe it is at hand now, or anywhere in sight—if we are not going to do that, the only way we can get an adequate reserve for the Army is in connection with the schools, where the boys will be glad to have training and where they can have it at the smallest possible expense under any plan, without the slightest disturbance to business or industry in any form. That is what we ought to do, and if we want to have a real reserve it is what we will do before we get through with the debate and pass this bill.

Therefore I am utterly unwilling to take any such hollow plan as section 56, which is urged on the one hand because the business men want to go off on a frolic and can not spare time enough to drill in the National Guard, and is urged on the other hand because it will provide a more efficient force than the militia. The utter inconsistency of the two positions shows how hard put are the proponents of this section for argument to support it with, and strengthens my conviction that it will accomplish nothing of practical importance, and had best be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am not going to attempt to speak. I rose merely to suggest that I hope the Senate will vote on this question now, and to say that because of the slow progress which has been made on the bill, after to-day I am going to request the Senate to hold evening sessions so that the bill may be disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, respecting the request made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] just now, I shall occupy but a few moments. I have not yet said a word upon this bill, although I am deeply interested in it. I believe in national preparedness, and I have so believed for many years. I believe that we are totally unprepared to-day to defend ourselves against any invasion of any first-class power. I have been receiving telegrams both for and against section 56. I received one this morning which I desire to read from a man whom I honor and respect. I have confidence in his judgment and wisdom as a citizen and as a soldier. He served his country in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War. He gave a splendid account of himself and won laurels for the State from which he enlisted. This telegram is dated April 5, Salt Lake City, Utah, and reads as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, April 5, 1916.

Hon. REED SMOOT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is my opinion that section 56, Senate bill, if enacted into law will force complete disorganization National Guard. If this force is destroyed don't believe a force of its present efficiency and numbers can be created by any scheme of citizen soldiery within 10 years.

E. A. WEDGWOOD,
Adjutant General.

Mr. President, if I believed what that telegram states, and I want to be frank in saying that I know the man who sent it believes it with all his heart, I would vote to strike out section 56. But I feel that he is too apprehensive of the result of such action. I believe, Mr. President, that if section 56 is retained in the bill it will in no way affect the future usefulness and effectiveness of our National Guard.

I know that our National Guard is composed of a splendid set of men. I know if this country was in trouble they would be among the foremost and best defenders of it. I know they are loyal and true Americans. I want the National Guard recognized to as great an extent as this bill provides for, and if I had my way it would be greater. I also believe that there should be a volunteer army, and while the one provided for in section 56 is not as I would wish, I shall vote for it. The expense of such an army has been referred to by many Senators, and it should be considered; but I believe with a first-class volunteer army peace will be easier maintained, and to secure this we should not hesitate at expending the amount that is provided for in the bill, and even a greater amount if necessary.

I believe that unpreparedness is the road to war. I am also fearful, Mr. President, that the National Guard can not be federalized, but will not discuss that question, as it has been so well covered by others. I have such faith in our National Guard I believe, that even if such was the case, all would respond and do their full duty if trouble came.

I shall content myself by saying that I shall vote to retain section 56.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I find myself in a position that I frequently occupy in this body. The debate has continued to such an extent that I fear to trespass upon the time of the Senate. It has continued for days and weeks, and we have heard arguments made over and over again. I have been ready to vote on this question at any time in the past week or 10 days. But so much turmoil has been created in various States, and in my State, that when I am called on to vote at this stage of the proceedings I think it is due to myself to state the reasons for the position which I propose to take.

I do not find anything in the pending proposition particularly pleasing to me. An attempt is being made to do something for the National Guard. A little sop, which will cost the people of the United States something like \$24,000,000, has been thrown to them, with no possible chance, in my belief, of enhancing in the slightest degree the efficiency of the National Guard. Something like \$24,000,000 is being thrown to the Volunteer Reserve Corps. It may do them a considerable amount of good, but in my humble judgment it is not going to result in the slightest degree to the advantage of the American people, unless there is something in the argument that a people like ourselves can be satisfied by a great expenditure of money, and that, being in a hysterical condition, the spectacle of Congress spending one hundred and odd million dollars will serve as a sort of sedative to their nerves and they will go through this period of public excitement with more comfort than they would otherwise have.

There may be something in what we are doing from that point of view, but it does seem to me it is a great pity in an emergency of this kind, when the people of the United States are actually aroused, that we can not keep ourselves free of the red tape, the cobwebs, the manacles, the ankle irons that traditions have forced upon us in the past when we were simply playing at having an army.

Now, the people are convinced that the recent events which have occurred in the world are of such a character that nations are likely to go to war against each other on slight pretense and for any or no reason. A great many people believe we have lived for years in a fool's paradise, when we believed that nations could not be gotten to go to war. No man would have been rash enough to predict that the situation which now exists in Europe could possibly take place, but here it is. It has a reflex effect upon the people of the United States, and they are crying out in their blind way for an army with which to defend them, and here we are talking about a volunteer reserve force, we are talking about a National Guard which we have ourselves made inefficient, and no one talks about the only thing that can be of any possible service to us in a time of emergency, to wit, the Regular Establishment of this country. It is admitted in these debates that we can not even enlist the Regular force up to the present authorized strength, and no one wants to do anything about that. There has been no suggestion made along those lines.

I want to state what I think this situation calls for. I realize the impossibility of coming in here on the floor of the Senate and attempting to recast a great military bill, but how pathetic it is to see it being dealt with in the old way—a little more

money, a few more men, this expenditure here, and that expenditure there, and after all it seems to me nothing absolutely is accomplished to bring about the result the American people want and for which the American people will be compelled to pay.

If I had my way the least I would do would be to raise the standing Army to 250,000 men. We can not get 100,000 now. Then, if we want 250,000 men what will common sense dictate that we should do? That we should make the regular service more attractive than it is. In a day when laboring men in the State of New Jersey are being paid as much as \$3 a day working in factories—not skilled mechanics but unskilled mechanics—we are asking men to go into the regular service, to put off their civilian caste and standing, to accept a subordinate position for the first time in their lives inferior in rank to some other man, for \$15 a month.

It was only in 1914 that the Executive order which provided what should be the rations of enlisted men carried food of a character that the ordinary mechanic's son in the United States was getting every day before he went into the Army. I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that so far as he has been able to do it he has reformed one of the most crying abuses in the military service. I approve absolutely and wholly of the ration list as now constituted. As it was constituted when I was connected with the United States service it was a disgrace to this or any other country, and particularly to a country like this, whose people are generous and willing to pay and feed the men who constitute their fighting force.

With an army of 250,000 or 300,000 regulars serving two years with the colors and serving four years in the reserves, you would have each year going into civil life 125,000 men. If, as suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], those 250,000 men were given vocational and educational training during those two years, that time would not be lost either to the men or to the Nation; they would return into the civil walks of life trained soldiers and better citizens than they were when they entered the Army.

The 125,000 men leaving the Army each year and going back to the civil walks of life to earn their own livelihood would be better citizens than they were before, and without the expenditure of the money that we now propose to expend, and for which, in my judgment, we will get nothing, we could have such a system brought about.

Every one of the nations now engaged in this great war relied first upon their regular establishment. We shall have to rely first upon our Regular Establishment, if we have a Regular Establishment worthy of the name. In 10 years, under the operation of a law such as I suggest, we would have 1,250,000 trained soldiers in civil life, every one of whom would or could be in the reserves, connected with the Federal Government, and control over him retained by the Federal Government; and behind that body of reserves and behind that body of regular trained soldiers we could sit back more or less at peace and then see what we could do with the National Guard, and then see what we could do with the volunteer reserve force and the other fads and fancies that arise to the minds of the people in the various sections of the country.

Now, I want to say a word with reference to the National Guard. A good deal of the criticism that has been leveled against the National Guard can be justified. I speak from experience. But I do not believe that the state the National Guard finds itself in to-day is chargeable to the Guard. The National Guard is essentially a State organization, and we are attempting to make a Federal organization out of it. It is good enough for the purposes for which it is intended, but there are constitutional and legal difficulties in the way of making it a good enough force for what we intend it to be.

I believe a man can secure good military training by service in the National Guard. I know the men who went into the volunteer service who had had the benefit of the training of the National Guard were better soldiers than the men who went into the volunteer service without the preliminary training of the National Guard. So I believe it is an easy matter to train men to the point of the efficiency required of the enlisted men; but I do not believe that it is possible for the man who is engaged in the activities of civil life, as a lawyer or as a doctor or as a banker, to devote enough time to the service to become sufficiently proficient in military affairs to be capable of commanding troops.

The enlisted man of the National Guard loves his officers; he has confidence in his officers; and he wants to serve under those officers. It seems to me it would be easy enough to evolve a system whereby, if called into active service by the Govern-

ment, he could be permitted to have over him a certain percentage of his National Guard officers. There could be a framework, a skeleton, of an organization throughout the National Guard; I would say, for instance, each company might be permitted to select its own captain. A certain standard of efficiency might be demanded of him before he accepted his commission; but after he has passed his examinations for captain and is the officer the company desires, and is properly commissioned by the governor and then by the President, that man could be paid sufficient money so that he could devote all his time and attention to the affairs of the National Guard. We could do that, and we could increase the pay of the Regular Army soldiers. Everything which I have suggested could be done. We should then have an efficient force and a powerful and numerous reserve body in this country; and yet we would not begin to expend the amount of money that we are proposing to expend on the experiments on which we are about to enter under this bill.

In other words, if we want an army, if we want to defend this Nation, if we want to feel safe and be at peace, let us get an army of professional soldiers; and behind that front rank of trained, professional fighting men let us organize, equip, and train a volunteer army.

I am sorry that the committee has not gone into this matter in a broader and more fundamental way than they have done. I have about come to the conclusion, after listening to the debates, that it is my duty to vote against section 56. I think I shall devote my energies as much as I can in the direction of providing adequately for the arming, equipping, and paying of the men of the Regular organization, for I believe firmly in my heart that they are the chief reliance of this Nation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not intend to interfere with the Senator, but I do hope that we may be able to get a vote this afternoon on the motion to strike out this section.

Mr. REED. The time that I take will not interfere with that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there has been a good deal said about the National Guard not being available in time of war. One example is worth all the theorizing in the world. I want to read merely a few sentences from a letter written by Gen. Clark, who is the commander of the Missouri National Guard, a lawyer of distinction and ability, and as good a citizen as there is in my State. He writes:

It was stated before the House committee the other day by Mr. Breckinridge, the Assistant Secretary of War, I believe, that at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War only 30 per cent of the National Guard volunteered. I have heard this statement made before, and I wish to say that so far as it applies to the National Guard of this State, it is absolutely without the semblance of truth. The records will show that in 1898, 100 per cent of the National Guard of this State volunteered for service in that war. I am reliably advised that this same condition existed in all of the States. My information is that only one organization in the United States declined to volunteer, and this grew out of some difficulty with the governor over the appointment of its officers. Statements of this kind are not believed by those who make them, and are made with a view solely to discrediting the National Guard.

Mr. President, this question presents itself to me in this form: It is proposed to have a Regular Army of 180,000 men. It is admitted that there will be difficulty in securing that many men for the Regular Army unless the pay is raised or other advantages additional to those now existing are afforded. It is proposed, then, to create a reserve force or a supplementary force to fall back upon in the event of war.

The National Guard exists; it is now reasonably well equipped. It has headquarters, armories, and officers. It is a body of men that certainly is 100 per cent in advance of the condition in which it was at the time the Spanish-American War broke out. It is constantly improving, but during all these years it has clamored for certain assistance, for certain opportunities which have been steadily denied it. This organization can be made a first-class organization.

The fear I have is that our committee—and I do not say it to unjustly charge anything against the committee—have in some way been led to a discrimination against the National Guard.

In illustration of what I am going to say I call attention to the fact that, if I understand this bill, and if others who have written me understand it, correctly, it is proposed that, in case of war and in case of the utilization of the National Guard, the officers above the rank of captain are to be then practically mustered out of the service, because there is no provision for pay for them. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if that is not the exact condition of the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No, Mr. President; they are not mustered out of the service. The bill as it was originally pro-

posed by the National Guard Association paid the higher officers, those above the rank of captain, salaries—quite large salaries—and the committee felt, from the evidence that they had before them, that the practical officer, the training man, the man who had most to do with the Guard, was the captain, because in many States they did not have regimental units, and we provided only for pay up to the grade of captain, except when the Guard were called into service, and then they were to get the pay of their rank.

Mr. REED. I do not think that makes it entirely clear. I have a letter from the colonel of the First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, who makes this comment:

The House bill now before the Senate provides that no officers but the captains and lieutenants of companies shall be paid. This eliminates the colonel, lieutenant colonel, the three majors, and several staff captains and lieutenants.

These men are absolutely necessary to the success of any organization, and, in fact, they are the ones that are compelled to bear a great part of the expense, and it is absolutely unjust that they should not be included in any provision for compensation. Their work, as a matter of fact, is work that there is the least reward to, as they have very little part in the show end of the Guard, and they are continually called on for funds of various kinds to cover expenses. I trust that you will insist on these officers being included as they were under the provisions of the Hay bill.

Section 112 of this same bill provides that officers and men who have signed the agreement and received compensation for their service may be called into the service in time of war. You can readily see that this is a joker by which all field and staff officers would be eliminated in case of trouble, and no one go into the field except the companies. In other words, the entire regiment as an organization would be destroyed.

Mr. President, here is this organization existing. As has been demonstrated in these debates, it has repeatedly proven its efficiency. As was stated the other day in the debate, in about five or six hours' time they were able in the State of Ohio to mobilize at one point 2,000 of these men. Instead of cutting down this organization, which exists, we ought to build it up.

Now what is proposed? To create a grand army of enthusiasm that is going to meet once a year for about 30 days, which I frankly admit can be gotten together to some extent during a time of war excitement, but which I utterly deny we have a single line of experience in this or any other country to warrant us in believing will come together on ordinary occasions. We are told that these gentlemen can come out for 30 days once a year, but that they can not join the National Guard. I want to know why? I want to know why a man who can give 30 days' time every year in the middle of the summer can not also give one night a week to attend drill at an armory? I say that you will encounter the greatest disappointment you have ever met with if you undertake to make an army by calling together an unorganized body of men—for that is what it will be—for 30 days each year, then allowing them to disintegrate and go to their homes. An army without headquarters, without equipment, and without cohesion. If these men come voluntarily and in great numbers at first, you will find that they will speedily disappear and disintegrate, like gentlemen do who go to a camp meeting and get enthusiastic, and then, after the camp meeting is over, nearly all forget there ever was a camp meeting. You will not get an army in that way; and if you spend \$25,000,000 in that way, you will have burned up that much money without result.

There is a way you can employ that money and get a result. Twenty-five million dollars would pay \$100 a year to 250,000 students in the schools and colleges in this country; it would pay the tuition of many of them; it would enable many a boy to go to school who can not now attend; you would reach the boy at a period of life when he has the time to devote and the energy to give to a military training. Why not use that money in advancing military science amongst those boys or young men who are already mobilized in your schools; who are already, figuratively speaking, in the camps; who are there where they can be reached? Why can you get them? First, because they are already mobilized; second, because young and ambitious men will enlist in companies and be willing to serve because they are associated with men like themselves—with their fellow students. There is no humiliation in such service; on the contrary, there is an inspiration in it. There would be a thronging into the ranks of schoolboys who would be willing to serve for a small compensation, and, as has been suggested here, the physical exercise and all that goes with military training would well repay our country for the money so expended.

I do not want to see an attempt made here to create three different kinds of armies. I do not want an army made up of shreds and patches. A Regular Army is absolutely all right, and I am willing to vote for a Regular Army of generous size; but back of that there ought to be one army, one organization, one system; and to its creation we should devote our energies. Then

if, in addition, you go into your public schools and give a general training to the youth of this country, you will in the end so disseminate military knowledge and discipline as to give abundant strength to the country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon suggests the absence of a quorum. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Gore | Myers | Smith, Ga. |
| Bankhead | Harding | Nelson | Smith, Md. |
| Beckham | Hardwick | Newlands | Smith, S. C. |
| Borah | Hitchcock | Norris | Smoot |
| Brandegee | Hollis | O'Gorman | Sterling |
| Broussard | Hughes | Oliver | Stone |
| Catron | Husting | Overman | Sutherland |
| Chamberlain | Johnson, Me. | Page | Swanson |
| Chilton | Johnson, S. Dak. | Pittman | Taggart |
| Clapp | Jones | Pomerene | Thomas |
| Clark, Wyo. | Kenyon | Ransdell | Townsend |
| Clarke, Ark. | Kern | Reed | Vardaman |
| Culberson | Lane | Robinson | Walsh |
| Cummins | Lewis | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Curtis | Lippitt | Shafroth | Weeks |
| Dillingham | Lodge | Sheppard | Williams |
| du Pont | McCumber | Sherman | Works |
| Gallinger | Martin, Va. | Simmons | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] to strike out section 56. On that the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. Unless I can obtain a transfer, I shall not be able to vote.

Mr. KERN (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on official business. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. In his absence I withhold by vote.

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GEORNA], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I am informed, however, that if present he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona].

Mr. LEWIS (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). I simply wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] and to say, by his permission, that if he were present and were permitted by his pair to vote he would vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg to announce a pair between the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH], who is unavoidably detained, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If the Senator from Connecticut were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], who is detained from the Senate on important business.

Mr. TOWNSEND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. Not being able to obtain a transfer of that pair, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—34.

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hughes | Overman | Smith, S. C. |
| Bankhead | Jones | Page | Stone |
| Clapp | Kenyon | Ransdell | Swanson |
| Clarke, Ark. | Kern | Reed | Taggart |
| Culberson | Lee, Md. | Robinson | Thompson |
| Cummins | Lewis | Shafroth | Vardaman |
| Curtis | McCumber | Sherman | Works |
| Gore | Martin, Va. | Simmons | |
| Hardwick | Norris | Smith, Ga. | |

NAYS—36.

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------|
| Beckham | Gallinger | Nelson | Smith, Md. |
| Borah | Hitchcock | Newlands | Smoot |
| Brandeggee | Hollis | O'Gorman | Sterling |
| Broussard | Husting | Oliver | Sutherland |
| Catron | Johnson, Me. | Pittman | Thomas |
| Chamberlain | Johnson, S. Dak. | Polindexter | Walsh |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lane | Pomerene | Warren |
| Dillingham | Lippitt | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| du Pont | Lodge | Sheppard | Williams |

NOT VOTING—26.

| | | | |
|----------|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| Brady | Goff | Martine, N. J. | Smith, Mich. |
| Bryan | Gronna | Myers | Tillman |
| Burleigh | Harding | Owen | Townsend |
| Chilton | James | Penrose | Underwood |
| Colt | La Follette | Phelan | Wadsworth |
| Fall | Lea, Tenn. | Shields | |
| Fletcher | McLean | Smith, Ariz. | |

So the motion of Mr. LEE of Maryland was rejected.

APPLICATIONS FOR PAROLE (S. DOC. NO. 389).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 28th ultimo, certain information relative to the operation of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended by the act of June 23, 1913, relative to the number of applications for parole under the law, etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1916.

Hon. JAMES M. BAKER,
Secretary United States Senate.

SIR: In accordance with the Senate resolution of the 28th ultimo asking for information relative to the operation of the act of June 25, 1910, and as amended by the act of June 23, 1913 (parole act), I have to inform you that there have been made 5,735 applications for parole under this law up to this date. Of this number, 1,756 have been recommended for parole by the board of which the warden is a member, 1,446 paroles have been granted, and there are 91 cases still pending.

In a very few cases the warden, acting as a member of the parole board, may have voted for parole and been overruled by the other two members of the board. It would be a very difficult matter to ascertain the number of such cases, and I am assuming that the words "recommended by the warden" appearing in the resolution were intended to read "recommended by the parole board."

Respectfully,

T. W. GREGORY, Attorney General.

DISTRICT GASLIGHT COMPANIES (S. DOC. NO. 390).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 14th ultimo, certain information as to the action taken by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enforce section 11 of the act of Congress of March 4, 1913, relative to the Washington Gas Light Co. and the Georgetown Gas Light Co., both of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 4, 1916.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit the following on the resolution passed by the Senate March 14, 1916, which provides—

"That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to report to the Senate as soon as practicable what steps, if any, have been taken by them since September 10, 1913, to enforce section 11 of the act of Congress entitled 'An act making

appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes,' approved March 4, 1913, so far as the same may affect the Washington Gas Light Co. and the Georgetown Gas Light Co., both of the District of Columbia."

Pursuant to the instructions of the commissioners, the corporation counsel, on September 15, 1913, filed in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia a bill in equity against the Washington Gas Light Co., asking for the dissolution of the company because it was holding certain stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. in violation of the anti-merger act of March 4, 1913. The bill prayed not only for a dissolution of the company but also for a sale of the stock so owned and held by the company. The Georgetown Gas Light Co. was made a party to this cause.

The gas companies answered the bill, issue was joined, and the case went to a hearing on the 5th of February, 1914.

Prior to the filing of this bill Thomas L. Hume had filed a bill, as one of the stockholders of the Washington Gas Light Co., against this company to have the stock of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. held by it sold and the proceeds distributed among the stockholders of the Washington Gas Light Co.

The Georgetown Gas Light Co. has also filed a bill against the Washington Gas Light Co. to have the same stock canceled and declared null and void because purchased and held in violation of law.

These three cases were consolidated and came on to be heard before Justices Gould and Stafford, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; evidence was taken therein and they were argued and submitted to the court for its decision on the 5th day of February, 1914. No decision has as yet been handed down by the court.

Very respectfully,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
By O. P. NEWMAN, President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5016) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 103) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1809. An act to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey;

S. 3391. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913;

S. 5977. An act to authorize the Shamokin, Sunbury & Lewisburg Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the borough of Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa., to Monroe township, Snyder County, Pa.;

S. 3978. An act to authorize the Catawissa Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, to construct a bridge across the west branch of the Susquehanna River from the borough of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., to the borough of West Milton, Union County, Pa.;

S. 4190. An act authorizing the Yankton County Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.;

H. R. 8466. An act to relieve J. Lawrence Latham, postmaster at Eupora, Webster County, Miss., of the payment of cash and funds stolen from the post office; and

H. R. 13769. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to supply tents for temporary use of the sufferers from the recent conflagration in Paris, Tex., and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for prohibition of liquor traffic in the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Island and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, representing approximately a membership of 300 ministers and an equal number of lay representatives, in its annual session in Foundry Church, Washington, D. C., Bishop Earl Cranston, D. D., LL. D., presiding, having learned from reliable sources of the sad havoc made by the liquor traffic among the natives of the Hawaiian Islands, whose death rate has been greatly accelerated by the use of alcoholic drink, for which they have a peculiar weakness, and having also learned that the saloons of Honolulu are a constant and alarming menace to the physical and moral welfare of the many thousands of our American soldiers garrisoned on the island of Oahu, far from home, surrounded by many temptations, with few restraints: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we most respectfully and earnestly petition both Houses of Congress now in session in favor of the passage of the bill pending in the Senate and House for the prohibition of the liquor traffic in the Territory of Hawaii.

Our interest in this matter is all the more vital and paramount because of the missionary and educational work now being prosecuted

on the islands by our representative mission boards for the uplift of the many weaker races domiciled there beneath the flag.

In conformity with the foregoing and by order of the conference, we the undersigned, affix hereto our official signatures.

EARL CRANSTON, *President*.
FRANK G. PORTER, *Secretary*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 4, 1916.

Mr. HUGHES presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., praying for an investigation into conditions surrounding the marketing of dairy products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of California, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lingle, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Bangor, Me., praying for military and naval defense of Penobscot Bay, Me., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of sundry citizens of Carpenter, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of J. D. Bishop and sundry other citizens of Garfield, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of Local Grange No. 201, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bellingham, and of William Valley Grange, No. 452, Patrons of Husbandry, of Deer Park, in the State of Washington, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange No. 201, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bellingham, and of Stranger Creek Grange, No. 374, Patrons of Husbandry, of Daisy, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorials of E. C. Kellogg and sundry other citizens, of College Place, and of C. D. Threlkeld and sundry other citizens, of Auburn, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Burnt Valley Grange, No. 509, Patrons of Husbandry, of Chewelah, Wash., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 2986) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 5401) to aid the State of Maryland to construct a military and post road, to be known as the National Defense Highway, connecting the United States Naval Academy grounds at Annapolis, the capital of Maryland, and the seat of the Federal Government, the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 5402) granting a pension to Charles Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 5403) authorizing the President to appoint John Gibbon a major and quartermaster in the Quartermaster's Department of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5404) granting a pension to Victor Tucker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 5405) granting an increase of pension to Francis Roy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 5406) for the enlargement, etc., of the assay office in the city of New York (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to state again, while Senators are all here, that beginning to-morrow, in order to speed this measure as much as possible, I shall ask that the Senate remain in session in the evening.

I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., Thursday, April 6, 1916), the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, April 7, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us, O Lord, Thy ways and incline our hearts to walk therein in spite of the temptations, trials, and barriers in the way. It is not ease, inertia, that makes the manly man, but the earnest, sincere efforts to do things worth while. "In the world ye shall have tribulations, but be of good cheer—I have overcome the world." The earnest for every truth-loving, noble-minded, self-sacrificing man, who lives to a purpose. So may we live and aspire, to be and to do, that the peace which passeth understanding may be ours, now and evermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 13006) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana, and the maintenance and operation of the bridge so reconstructed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE WABASH RIVER.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to correct a mistake made on Monday in an emergency bill for a bridge. Overlooking the fact that an identical Senate bill was on the Speaker's table, a House bill was passed and sent to the Senate, but it was recalled. It is H. R. 13006. I ask unanimous consent that it be reconsidered and all proceedings vacated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all proceedings by which the bill H. R. 13006 was passed be vacated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be considered. It is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5016) to authorize the reconstruction of an existing bridge across the Wabash River at Silverwood, in the State of Indiana.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Co., and Walter L. Ross, its receiver, their successors or assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to reconstruct the bridge of said company and operate the same across the Wabash River at or near Silverwood, Ind., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the line of the existing bridge of said company, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.